

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE



Bulletin

Vol. XLV, No. 1164

October 16, 1961

"LET US CALL A TRUCE TO TERROR" • <i>Address</i> <i>by President Kennedy</i>	619
FOUR CENTRAL THREADS OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY • <i>Remarks by Secretary Rusk</i>	625
A PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP • <i>by Assistant Secretary</i> <i>McConaughy</i>	634
SOUTHERN AFRICA IN TRANSITION • <i>by Assistant</i> <i>Secretary Williams</i>	638
U.S. SUBMITS PROPOSAL FOR GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT TO U.N.	650

THE
OFFICIAL
WEEKLY RECORD
OF
UNITED STATES
FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

1

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XLV, No. 1164 • PUBLICATION 7283

October 16, 1961

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$8.50, foreign \$12.25
Single copy, 25 cents

Use of funds for printing of this publication
approved by the Director of the Bureau
of the Budget (January 19, 1961).

Note: Contents of this publication are not
copyrighted and items contained herein may
be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT
OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be
appreciated. The BULLETIN is indexed in the
Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature.

*The Department of State BULLETIN,
a weekly publication issued by the
Office of Public Services, Bureau of
Public Affairs, provides the public
and interested agencies of the
Government with information on
developments in the field of foreign
relations and on the work of the
Department of State and the Foreign
Service. The BULLETIN includes se-
lected press releases on foreign policy,
issued by the White House and the
Department, and statements and ad-
dresses made by the President and by
the Secretary of State and other
officers of the Department, as well as
special articles on various phases of
international affairs and the func-
tions of the Department. Infor-
mation is included concerning treaties
and international agreements to
which the United States is or may
become a party and treaties of gen-
eral international interest.*

*Publications of the Department,
United Nations documents, and legis-
lative material in the field of inter-
national relations are listed currently.*

"Let Us Call a Truce to Terror"

Address by President Kennedy¹

We meet in an hour of grief and challenge. Dag Hammarskjold is dead. But the United Nations lives. His tragedy is deep in our hearts, but the task for which he died is at the top of our agenda. A noble servant of peace is gone. But the quest for peace lies before us.

The problem is not the death of one man; the problem is the life of this Organization. It will either grow to meet the challenge of our age, or it will be gone with the wind, without influence, without force, without respect. Were we to let it die, to enfeeble its vigor, to cripple its powers, we would condemn the future.

For in the development of this Organization rests the only true alternative to war, and war appeals no longer as a rational alternative. Unconditional war can no longer lead to unconditional victory. It can no longer serve to settle disputes. It can no longer concern the great powers alone. For a nuclear disaster, spread by winds and waters and fear, could well engulf the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the committed and the uncommitted alike. Mankind must put an end to war, or war will put an end to mankind.

So let us here resolve that Dag Hammarskjold did not live—or die—in vain. Let us call a truce to terror. Let us invoke the blessings of peace. And, as we build an international capacity to keep peace, let us join in dismantling the national capacity to wage war.

¹ Made before the 16th session of the U.N. General Assembly at the United Nations, N.Y., on Sept. 25 (White House press release; as-delivered text).

Dedication to U.N. Charter and World Law

This will require new strength and new roles for the United Nations. For disarmament without checks is but a shadow, and a community without law is but a shell. Already the United Nations has become both the measure and the vehicle of man's most generous impulses. Already it has provided—in the Middle East, in Asia, in Africa this year in the Congo—a means of holding violence within bounds.

But the great question which confronted this body in 1945 is still before us: whether man's cherished hopes for progress and peace are to be destroyed by terror and disruption, whether the "foul winds of war" can be tamed in time to free the cooling winds of reason, and whether the pledges of our charter are to be fulfilled or defied—pledges to secure peace, progress, human rights, and world law.

In this hall there are not three forces, but two. One is composed of those who are trying to build the kind of world described in articles 1 and 2 of the charter. The other, seeking a far different world, would undermine this Organization in the process.

Today of all days our dedication to the charter must be maintained. It must be strengthened, first of all, by the selection of an outstanding civil servant to carry forward the responsibilities of the Secretary-General—a man endowed with both the wisdom and the power to make meaningful the moral force of the world community. The late Secretary-General nurtured and sharpened the United Nations' obligation to act. But he did

not invent it. It was there in the charter. It is still there in the charter.

However difficult it may be to fill Mr. Hammarskjold's place, it can better be filled by one man rather than by three. Even the three horses of the troika did not have three drivers, all going in different directions. They had only one, and so must the United Nations executive. To install a triumvirate, or any rotating authority, in the United Nations administrative offices would replace order with anarchy, action with paralysis, and confidence with confusion.

The Secretary-General, in a very real sense, is the servant of the General Assembly. Diminish his authority and you diminish the authority of the only body where all nations, regardless of power, are equal and sovereign. Until all the powerful are just, the weak will be secure only in the strength of this Assembly.

Effective and independent executive action is not the same question as balanced representation. In view of the enormous change in membership in this body since its founding, the American delegation will join in any effort for the prompt review and revision of the composition of United Nations bodies.

But to give this Organization three drivers, to permit each great power to decide its own case, would entrench the cold war in the headquarters of peace. Whatever advantages such a plan may hold out to my own country, as one of the great powers, we reject it. For we far prefer world law, in the age of self-determination, to world war, in the age of mass extermination.

Plan for General and Complete Disarmament

Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

Men no longer debate whether armaments are a symptom or a cause of tension. The mere existence of modern weapons—ten million times more powerful than anything the world has ever seen and only minutes away from any target on earth—is a source of horror and discord and distrust.

Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes, for disarmament must be a part of any permanent settlement. And men may no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness, for in a spiraling arms race a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase.

For 15 years this Organization has sought the reduction and destruction of arms. Now that goal is no longer a dream; it is a practical matter of life or death. The risks inherent in disarmament pale in comparison to the risks inherent in an unlimited arms race.

It is in this spirit that the recent Belgrade conference,² recognizing that this is no longer a Soviet problem or an American problem but a human problem, endorsed a program of "general, complete and strictly and internationally controlled disarmament." It is in this same spirit that we in the United States have labored this year, with a new urgency and with a new, now-statutory agency fully endorsed by the Congress, to find an approach to disarmament which would be so far-reaching yet realistic, so mutually balanced and beneficial, that it could be accepted by every nation. And it is in this spirit that we have presented, with the agreement of the Soviet Union, under the label both nations now accept of "general and complete disarmament," a new statement of newly agreed principles for negotiation.³

But we are well aware that all issues of principle are not settled and that principles alone are not enough. It is therefore our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race but to a peace race—to advance together step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has been achieved. We invite them now to go beyond agreement in principle to reach agreement on actual plans.

The program to be presented to this Assembly for general and complete disarmament under effective international control⁴ moves to bridge the gap between those who insist on a gradual approach and those who talk only of the final and total achievement. It would create machinery to keep the peace as it destroys the machines of war.

² For background, see BULLETIN of Oct. 2, 1961, p. 539.

³ *Ibid.*, Oct. 9, 1961, p. 589.

⁴ See p. 650.

It would proceed through balanced and safeguarded stages designed to give no state a military advantage over another. It would place the final responsibility for verification and control where it belongs—not with the big powers alone, not with one's adversary or one's self, but in an international organization within the framework of the United Nations. It would assure that indispensable condition of disarmament—true inspection—and apply it in stages proportionate to the stage of disarmament. It would cover delivery systems as well as weapons. It would ultimately halt their production as well as their testing, their transfer as well as their possession. It would achieve, under the eye of an international disarmament organization, a steady reduction in forces, both nuclear and conventional, until it has abolished all armies and all weapons except those needed for internal order and a new United Nations Peace Force. And it starts that process now, today, even as the talks begin.

In short, general and complete disarmament must no longer be a slogan, used to resist the first steps. It is no longer to be a goal without means of achieving it, without means of verifying its progress, without means of keeping the peace. It is now a realistic plan and a test—a test of those only willing to talk and a test of those willing to act.

Such a plan would not bring a world free from conflict or greed, but it would bring a world free from the terrors of mass destruction. It would not usher in the era of the super state, but it would usher in an era in which no state could annihilate or be annihilated by another.

In 1946, this nation proposed the Baruch plan to internationalize the atom before other nations even possessed the bomb or demilitarized their troops.⁵ We proposed with our allies the disarmament plan of 1951⁶ while still at war in Korea. And we make our proposals today, while building up our defenses over Berlin, not because we are inconsistent or insincere or intimidated but because we know the rights of free men will prevail—because, while we are compelled against our will to rearm, we look confidently beyond Berlin

⁵ For an address by Bernard M. Baruch at the opening session of the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission on June 14, 1946, see BULLETIN of June 23, 1946, p. 1057.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Nov. 19, 1951, p. 799.

to the kind of disarmed world we all prefer.

I therefore propose, on the basis of this plan, that disarmament negotiations resume promptly and continue without interruption until an entire program for general and complete disarmament has not only been agreed but has been actually achieved.

Proposals To Halt Testing and Nuclear Arms Race

The logical place to begin is a treaty assuring the end of nuclear tests of all kinds, in every environment, under workable controls. The United States and the United Kingdom have proposed such a treaty⁷ that is both reasonable, effective, and ready for signature. We are still prepared to sign that treaty today.

We also proposed a mutual ban on atmospheric testing,⁸ without inspection or controls, in order to save the human race from the poison of radioactive fallout. We regret that that offer was not accepted.⁹

For 15 years we have sought to make the atom an instrument of peaceful growth rather than of war. But for 15 years our concessions have been matched by obstruction, our patience by intransigence. And the pleas of mankind for peace have met with disregard.

Finally, as the explosions of others beclouded the skies, my country was left with no alternative but to act in the interests of its own and the free world's security.¹⁰ We cannot endanger that security by refraining from testing while others improve their arsenals. Nor can we endanger it by another long, uninspected ban on testing. For 3 years we accepted those risks in our open society while seeking agreement on inspection. But this year, while we were negotiating in good faith in Geneva, others were secretly preparing new experiments in destruction.

Our tests are not polluting the atmosphere. Our deterrent weapons are guarded against accidental explosion or use. Our doctors and scientists stand ready to help any nation measure and

⁷ For text, see *ibid.*, June 5, 1961, p. 870.

⁸ For text, see *ibid.*, Sept. 18, 1961, p. 476.

⁹ For a U.S.-U.K. statement and text of a declaration of Premier Khrushchev, see *ibid.*, Sept. 25, 1961, p. 515.

¹⁰ For a statement by the President on Sept. 5, see *ibid.*, Sept. 18, 1961, p. 475.

meet the hazards to health which inevitably result from the tests in the atmosphere.

But to halt the spread of these terrible weapons, to halt the contamination of the air, to halt the spiraling nuclear arms race, we remain ready to seek new avenues of agreement. Our new disarmament program thus includes the following proposals:

- First, signing the test ban treaty by all nations. This can be done now. Test ban negotiations need not and should not await general disarmament.
- Second, stopping the production of fissionable materials for use in weapons and preventing their transfer to any nation now lacking in nuclear weapons.
- Third, prohibiting the transfer of control over nuclear weapons to states that do not own them.
- Fourth, keeping nuclear weapons from seeding new battlegrounds in outer space.
- Fifth, gradually destroying existing nuclear weapons and converting their materials to peaceful uses; and
- Finally, halting the unlimited testing and production of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles and gradually destroying them as well.

Worldwide Law and Law Enforcement

To destroy arms, however, is not enough. We must create even as we destroy—creating worldwide law and law enforcement as we outlaw worldwide war and weapons. In the world we seek, the United Nations emergency forces which have been hastily assembled, uncertainly supplied, and inadequately financed will never be enough.

Therefore, the United States recommends that all member nations earmark special peacekeeping units in their armed forces, to be on call of the United Nations, to be specially trained and quickly available, and with advance provision for financial and logistic support.

In addition, the American delegation will suggest a series of steps to improve the United Nations' machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes, for on-the-spot factfinding, mediation, and adjudication, for extending the rule of international law. For peace is not solely a matter of military or technical problems; it is primarily a problem of politics and people. And unless man

can match his strides in weaponry and technology with equal strides in social and political development, our great strength, like that of the dinosaur, will become incapable of proper control and, like the dinosaur, vanish from the earth.

Extending the Rule of Law to Outer Space

As we extend the rule of law on earth, so must we also extend it to man's new domain—outer space.

All of us salute the brave cosmonauts of the Soviet Union. The new horizons of outer space must not be riven by the old bitter concepts of imperialism and sovereign claims. The cold reaches of the universe must not become the new arena of an even colder war.

To this end we shall urge proposals extending the United Nations Charter to the limits of man's exploration in the universe, reserving outer space for peaceful use, prohibiting weapons of mass destruction in space or on celestial bodies, and opening the mysteries and benefits of space to every nation. We shall further propose cooperative efforts between all nations in weather prediction and eventually in weather control. We shall propose, finally, a global system of communications satellites linking the whole world in telegraph and telephone and radio and television. The day need not be far away when such a system will televise the proceedings of this body to every corner of the world for the benefit of peace.

United Nations Decade of Development

But the mysteries of outer space must not divert our eyes or our energies from the harsh realities that face our fellow men. Political sovereignty is but a mockery without the means of meeting poverty and illiteracy and disease. Self-determination is but a slogan if the future holds no hope.

That is why my nation, which has freely shared its capital and its technology to help others help themselves, now proposes officially designating this decade of the 1960's as the United Nations Decade of Development. Under the framework of that resolution, the United Nations' existing efforts in promoting economic growth can be expanded and coordinated. Regional surveys and training institutes can now pool the talents of many. New research, technical assistance, and

pilot projects can unlock the wealth of less developed lands and untapped waters. And development can become a cooperative and not a competitive enterprise, to enable all nations, however diverse in their systems and beliefs, to become in fact as well as in law free and equal nations.

Colonialism and the Principle of Free Choice

My country favors a world of free and equal states. We agree with those who say that colonialism is a key issue in this Assembly. But let the full facts of that issue be discussed in full.

On the one hand is the fact that, since the close of World War II, a worldwide declaration of independence has transformed nearly 1 billion people and 9 million square miles into 42 free and independent states. Less than 2 percent of the world's population now lives in "dependent" territories.

I do not ignore the remaining problems of traditional colonialism which still confront this body. Those problems will be solved, with patience, good will, and determination. Within the limits of our responsibility in such matters, my country intends to be a participant and not merely an observer in the peaceful, expeditious movement of nations from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals. That continuing tide of self-determination, which runs so strong, has our sympathy and our support.

But colonialism in its harshest forms is not only the exploitation of new nations by old, of dark skins by light—or the subjugation of the poor by the rich. My nation was once a colony, and we know what colonialism means; the exploitation and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of the many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to be governed, whatever their continent, their class, or their color.

And that is why there is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not reached the Communist empire, where a population far larger than that officially termed "dependent" lives under governments installed by foreign troops instead of free institutions, under a system which knows only one party and one belief, which suppresses free debate and free elections and free newspapers and free books and free trade unions, and which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners. Let us debate

colonialism in full and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every corner of the globe.

Two Threats to the Peace

Finally, as President of the United States, I consider it my duty to report to this Assembly on two threats to the peace which are not on your crowded agenda but which cause us, and most of you, the deepest concern.

The first threat on which I wish to report is widely misunderstood: the smoldering coals of war in southeast Asia. South Viet-Nam is already under attack—sometimes by a single assassin, sometimes by a band of guerrillas, recently by full battalions. The peaceful borders of Burma, Cambodia, and India have been repeatedly violated. And the peaceful people of Laos are in danger of losing the independence they gained not so long ago.

No one can call these "wars of liberation." For these are free countries living under their own governments. Nor are these aggressions any less real because men are knifed in their homes and not shot in the fields of battle.

The very simple question confronting the world community is whether measures can be devised to protect the small and weak from such tactics. For if they are successful in Laos and south Viet-Nam, the gates will be opened wide.

The United States seeks for itself no base, no territory, no special position in this area of any kind. We support a truly neutral and independent Laos, its people free from outside interference, living at peace with themselves and with their neighbors, assured that their territory will not be used for attacks on others, and under a government comparable (as Mr. Khrushchev and I agreed at Vienna¹¹) to Cambodia and Burma.

But now the negotiations over Laos are reaching a crucial stage. The cease-fire is at best precarious. The rainy season is coming to an end. Laotian territory is being used to infiltrate south Viet-Nam. The world community must recognize—all those who are involved—that this potent threat to Laotian peace and freedom is indivisible from all other threats to their own.

Secondly, I wish to report to you on the crisis over Germany and Berlin. This is not the time or the place for immoderate tones, but the world

¹¹ For background, see *ibid.*, June 26, 1961, p. 991.

community is entitled to know the very simple issues as we see them. If there is a crisis it is because an existing peace is under threat, because an existing island of free people is under pressure, because solemn agreements are being treated with indifference. Established international rights are being threatened with unilateral usurpation. Peaceful circulation has been interrupted by barbed wire and concrete blocks.

One recalls the order of the Czar in Pushkin's *Boris Godunov*: "Take steps at this very hour that our frontiers be fenced in by barriers. . . . That not a single soul pass o'er the border, that not a hare be able to run or a crow to fly."

It is absurd to allege that we are threatening a war merely to prevent the Soviet Union and East Germany from signing a so-called "treaty of peace." The Western Allies are not concerned with any paper arrangement the Soviets may wish to make with a regime of their own creation, on territory occupied by their own troops and governed by their own agents. No such action can affect either our rights or our responsibilities.

If there is a dangerous crisis in Berlin—and there is—it is because of threats against the vital interests and the deep commitments of the Western Powers and the freedom of West Berlin. We cannot yield these interests. We cannot fail these commitments. We cannot surrender the freedom of these people for whom we are responsible. A "peace treaty" which carried with it the provisions which destroy the peace would be a fraud. A "free city" which was not genuinely free would suffocate freedom and would be an infamy.

For a city or a people to be truly free, they must have the secure right, without economic, political, or police pressure, to make their own choice and to live their own lives. And as I have said before, if anyone doubts the extent to which our presence is desired by the people of West Berlin, we are ready to have that question submitted to a free vote in all Berlin and, if possible, among all the German people.

The elementary fact about this crisis is that it is unnecessary. The elementary tools for a peaceful settlement are to be found in the charter. Under its law, agreements are to be kept, unless changed by all those who made them. Established rights are to be respected. The political disposition of peoples should rest upon their own wishes, freely expressed in plebiscites or free elections. If there are legal problems, they can

be solved by legal means. If there is a threat of force, it must be rejected. If there is desire for change, it must be a subject for negotiation, and if there is negotiation, it must be rooted in mutual respect and concern for the rights of others.

The Western Powers have calmly resolved to defend, by whatever means are forced upon them, their obligations and their access to the free citizens of West Berlin and the self-determination of those citizens. This generation learned from bitter experience that either brandishing or yielding to threats can only lead to war. But firmness and reason can lead to the kind of peaceful solution in which my country profoundly believes.

We are committed to no rigid formula. We see no perfect solution. We recognize that troops and tanks can, for a time, keep a nation divided against its will, however unwise that policy may seem to us. But we believe a peaceful agreement is possible which protects the freedom of West Berlin and Allied presence and access, while recognizing the historic and legitimate interests of others in assuring European security.

The possibilities of negotiation are now being explored; it is too early to report what the prospects may be. For our part, we would be glad to report at the appropriate time that a solution has been found. For there is no need for a crisis over Berlin, threatening the peace, and if those who created this crisis desire peace, there will be peace and freedom in Berlin.

Responsibilities of U.N. General Assembly

The events and decisions of the next 10 months may well decide the fate of man for the next 10,000 years. There will be no avoiding those events. There will be no appeal from these decisions. And we in this hall shall be remembered either as part of the generation that turned this planet into a flaming funeral pyre or the generation that met its vow "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

In the endeavor to meet that vow, I pledge you every effort this nation possesses. I pledge you that we shall neither commit nor provoke aggression, that we shall neither flee nor invoke the threat of force, that we shall never negotiate out of fear, we shall never fear to negotiate.

Terror is not a new weapon. Throughout history it has been used by those who could not prevail, either by persuasion or example. But

inevitably they fail, either because men are not afraid to die for a life worth living or because the terrorists themselves come to realize that free men cannot be frightened by threats and that aggression would meet its own response. And it is in the light of that history that every nation today should know, be he friend or foe, that the United States has both the will and the weapons to join free men in standing up to their responsibilities.

But I come here today to look across this world of threats to the world of peace. In that search we cannot expect any final triumph, for new problems will always arise. We cannot expect that all nations will adopt like systems, for conformity is the jailer of freedom and the enemy of growth. Nor can we expect to reach our goal

by contrivance, by fiat, or even by the wishes of all.

But however close we sometimes seem to that dark and final abyss, let no man of peace and freedom despair. For he does not stand alone. If we all can persevere—if we can in every land and office look beyond our own shores and ambitions—then surely the age will dawn in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

Ladies and gentlemen of this Assembly, the decision is ours. Never have the nations of the world had so much to lose—or so much to gain. Together we shall save our planet, or together we shall perish in its flames. Save it we can—and save it we must—and then shall we earn the eternal thanks of mankind and, as peacemakers, the eternal blessing of God.

Four Central Threads of U.S. Foreign Policy

REMARKS BY SECRETARY RUSK¹

We meet today at the beginning of a General Assembly, which itself is meeting in a climactic period in world affairs. There will be some 96 or more items on its agenda. It is not my purpose today to try to comment on those items but to speak briefly on certain aspects of the problems of the United Nations—to speak briefly in order to prepare the way for your questions within the time which is available. I shall try not to filibuster in order to shut off your questions.

But these 96 items include some of the most far-reaching, complex, dangerous, important problems before mankind, such as the nuclear arms race, as well as administrative questions such as a staff pension plan.

Some of these items are hardy perennials. You have seen them before. You will undoubtedly see them again. They will remind us that not all

questions are solved promptly. Some questions are handled over time, and perhaps some issues can be improved and made less dangerous by applying the poultices or the processes of peaceful settlement represented in the United Nations. But I would suggest to you that no item on the agenda is really unimportant. Some of them will involve attempts to settle difficult and dangerous disputes, but others, and many others, will be involved with the process of building a decent world order.

And, if I might have the privilege of making a recommendation to my colleagues of the press, I would hope that you would help us bring to the attention of the peoples of your countries the great unseen, unsung work of the international community which is going on every day, every week, throughout the world, trying to bring into being a dream which man dared to dream at a time when he was chastened by the bitterest war of our history.

Today I should like to comment on four central

¹ Made before the Foreign Press Association at New York, N.Y., on Sept. 22 (U.S./U.N. press release 3778).

threads of United States policy, which will help us and perhaps you in understanding some of our reactions to the almost hundred items on the agenda of the United Nations. Let me say at the beginning that I know that, when I speak of these central threads of United States policy, there will undoubtedly be some questioning, perhaps a trace of cynicism, some doubts, because one can think of instances where these policies do not appear to be carried fully into effect. May I remind you that—to use the language of the baseball field—at this period of history the United States by and large is expected to bat 1.000. The center of world attention, in a position of leadership at a time when influence on United States policy is a primary object of most foreign offices throughout the world, at a time when we inevitably find ourselves involved in problems throughout the world, therefore in the middle of many disputes, whether of our own making or not, it is not easy for a great power such as the United States to be always entirely simple, entirely clear, even in the application of its most profound commitments. What we can say is that we are determined to work hard, persistently, and in the best means available to us under the circumstances, to give effect to these commitments.

Commitment to the United Nations

I would suggest, if I may without presumption, that our first commitment with respect to an agenda such as we have in front of us is our commitment to the United Nations itself. If I were advising a foreign correspondent or a new ambassador reporting to Washington about how he could best predict the long-range, instinctive reactions of the American people to particular situations, I would suggest that he look first at the preamble and articles 1 and 2 of the United Nations Charter, because I am deeply convinced that in those sections are accurately and succinctly reflected the long-range foreign policy of the American people. I believe that that charter describes the kind of world we should like to see come into being. I believe that charter was drawn to describe that kind of world when men's feelings were disciplined by a war, when their hopes were elevated by the prospects of peace, when men sat down quietly and with patience and dared to think about the kind of world we ought to have.

The most immediate matter in front of us in regard to our commitments to the United Nations is of course the problem of the Secretary-General, brought about by the death of the great man to whom we have just paid tribute, for the United Nations is at a critical crossroads as a result of the unexpected and tragic death of Secretary-General Hammarskjold. The United Nations is now engaged in urgent peacekeeping action in the Congo, in the Middle East, and elsewhere throughout the world. Its widespread activities—political, economic, social, and humanitarian—demand strong, uninterrupted executive leadership. The Secretariat must continue to be directed with vigor, confidence, and integrity.

It is unfortunately clear, however, that an immediate agreement cannot be expected on the naming of a permanent Secretary-General. The United States therefore believes that action must be taken now to assure that the functions of the office of the Secretary-General are performed effectively and fully while agreement is sought on the appointment of a new Secretary-General.

An outstanding world leader should be named immediately to perform the functions of the office of the Secretary-General for a temporary period, during which efforts to elect a permanent Secretary-General should proceed in accordance with article 97 of the charter.

The authority of the office of the Secretary-General must not be compromised. A "troika" or a panel in any form and at any level of the Secretariat would paralyze the executive of the United Nations and weaken it irreparably. Whoever is appointed should perform the full functions of the office.

The General Assembly, we believe, has full authority to make such a provisional appointment. By the terms of the charter the Assembly has the power to regulate appointments in the Secretariat. That power necessarily includes provisional arrangements for carrying on the functions of the Secretariat's chief officer in emergencies. It has used that power before on at least two important occasions.

The first of these was in 1946 prior to the formal election of a Secretary-General, when the General Assembly adopted the proposal of its President that the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Preparatory Commission be authorized to

carry on the duties of Secretary-General pending the appointment of the Secretary-General.

The second occasion was in 1950, when the Security Council was deadlocked in attempting to choose a successor to the first Secretary-General, Mr. Trygve Lie. In November of that year, by a vote of 46 to 5 with 8 abstentions, the General Assembly decided that the present Secretary-General should be continued in office for a period of 3 years.²

The vital interests of the members of the United Nations are heavily involved in this question. The Assembly must move rapidly to fill the void. Events cannot permit drift and indecision in the leadership of the United Nations. We must not allow the prestige and authority of the Organization to be dissipated by delay or by diminution of the effectiveness of an office which has become one of the United Nations' unique contributions to the peace of the world.

Commitment to Growth of Law Among Nations

I have spoken of our commitment to the United Nations as the first of the central threads of American policy. I should think a second central thread would be our commitment to the growth of law in relations among nations. We believe that the history of man has shown that the development of law enlarges and does not restrict freedom. In our own personal affairs we understand that we as individuals pass in the course of a single day through hundreds and sometimes thousands of legal relationships, some of them active, many of them latent, some called into play by our own action, others called into play by the action of government or by the conduct of others. But in the mystery and majesty of the operations of law, each of us finds it possible to go through our eccentric orbits with a maximum amount of personal freedom.

That process of law is steadily going on in the international community. On every working day throughout the year, in meetings all over the world, on almost every imaginable subject, arrangements are being reached across national frontiers which make it possible for us to enlarge our respective areas of freedom and to get on with the world's work with harmony.

² U.N. doc. A/RES/492 (V); for text, see BULLETIN of Nov. 20, 1950, p. 831.

Commitment to Freedom

The third commitment and central thread of American policy is our commitment to freedom. This commitment is a part of an ancient dialog of the human race, a discussion of the political consequences of the nature of man. In the late 18th century those who came before us articulated it in the proposition that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. I believe that the American people deeply believe that simple proposition. And we find it important that, when you look through the present membership of the United Nations, you find more than 60 independent members who have traveled the path of national independence—including the United States, of course—and that, looking back on the history of the independence of those 60 members, one can find the sympathy and the support, the influence and the help, of the American people expressed in many different ways.

This commitment to freedom causes complications because it is worldwide, because it has to do with the nature of man. It explains our instinctive reactions to certain issues in the colonial field. It explains our concern about what is going on in areas where the people live under dictatorships. It explains why we are more comfortable with close, democratic friends than with other forms of government. It explains why our consciences are disturbed when we are not able to perform within our own society in full accordance with our own deepest commitments.

Commitment to Economic and Social Advancement

Our fourth thread of policy is our commitment to economic and social advancement deeply written into the charter of the United Nations and drawn out of our own national experience. Indeed, we believe that there is an intimate link between economic and social advancement on the one side and freedom on the other. In our own history these two have come together. Indeed, the institutions of freedom were strengthened and enlarged to permit more rapid economic and social advancement. We believe that free institutions provide the machinery, the impetus, the inspiration, through which the resources of men can be mobilized for such advancement and that authoritarian forms cannot properly claim to have special advantage in the speed of development.

To us these are four important commitments. We shall be saying a great deal about them in the United Nations in the weeks and months ahead. When we come to the end of the Assembly, the right question to ask, it seems to me, will be: Has the 16th session of the General Assembly moved us a few steps further along the way toward the kind of world society to which we all are committed under the charter? These words—committed or noncommitted—come in for a great deal of discussion these days. As far as the United States is concerned, we do believe that there are basic common interests between us and all those governments and peoples who understand their own basic commitments to be to the charter and to the principles inscribed in that charter.

Man has lived through some rather dreadful events. He has been seeking his way up a rather slippery glacier for centuries. He has been trying to reach a level of civilized condition which accords with the dignity of man himself. He has chipped out fingerholds and toeholds, sometimes with extraordinary skill, and he can be proud of his accomplishments. But below there remains the abyss, and a few slips can plunge him back again to the jungle out of which he has tried to rise.

These are the issues that underlie the work of an Assembly such as the 16th Assembly. I believe myself that there is great strength in the charter, in the commitment of men to the charter, in the common interests which tie us together. I believe that we can move ahead with confidence and with courage and without fear of those particular storm clouds which are now on the horizon and which must, of course, be somehow dispersed. Thank you very much.

QUESTION-AND-ANSWER PERIOD

Dr. Hans Steinitz (chairman): Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary, for your inspiring and highly interesting and valuable address which, I suppose, will give an opportunity for a number of questions from the floor.

Dr. Otto Leichter (Deutsche Presse Agentur (dpa), Hamburg): Mr. Secretary, how do you judge the chances of an interim solution [to the problem of a Secretary-General] as indicated by you on the basis of your contacts in the recent

days, including your talk with Mr. Gromyko [Andrei A. Gromyko, Soviet Foreign Minister]? And do you think of any alternatives in the case of a complete deadlock?

THE SECRETARY: If I did not in my remarks earlier refer to my luncheon conversation of yesterday, it was not forgetfulness on my part. (Laughter.) Actually, we did not get into the question of a provisional or temporary solution to the present problem.

There are two quite different problems. The one is to elect a permanent Secretary-General as provided in the charter. The "troika" proposal indicates that there will be very great difficulty indeed in the election of a new Secretary-General, unless there is some modification on the part of those who have put the "troika" proposal forward.

That very fact makes it necessary for the United Nations—if it is to continue to function vigorously and actively during a troubled period—to turn to a temporary arrangement, a provisional arrangement.

We believe that, in the absence of the ability of the Security Council to come to a quick agreement on a new Secretary-General, the General Assembly has the power and must exercise it to move promptly with the interim arrangement. We believe this accords with the judgment and view of the vast majority of the United Nations, and we would hope that they could move promptly in this direction.

Paul F. Sanders (Het Parool, Amsterdam): Mr. Secretary, the question how to strengthen the free-world community has become more urgent than ever in the circumstances we live under. May we in Senator Fulbright's ideas on a concert of free nations, as stated in an article in the latest issue of Foreign Affairs, read some of the thinking of this administration? And, sir, in this respect, does the United States have any plans or new plans to use its influence on the establishment of European unity besides what already has been done in the economic field, as in the Common Market?

THE SECRETARY: I would not wish to comment in detail on Senator Fulbright's article. The general purpose, the general objective, which he discussed in his article is of course, I think, the objective of all of us in the free world. But the United States and its friends are acting in a num-

ber of relationships and circles. We attach the greatest possible importance to the strengthening of the community of interests which is represented, as I indicated earlier, in the charter of the United Nations and to work there for the building of a worldwide community of common interests and peaceful adjustment. We also believe that we must work intimately and closely to strengthen the North Atlantic community on the political side, on the economic side, and, to the extent necessary, on the military side. And this process of consultation is becoming all the time more intimate and, I think, more effective.

There are other communities, such as the Organization of American States, to which we are deeply committed and in other parts of the world associations which to us are very important.

I think that in time, in such agencies as these and through the United Nations, the free world will strengthen these ties which are fundamental to us all and that relationships across regional frontiers will be strengthened in the general direction of which Senator Fulbright was talking. I think his article was not an official administration point of view, but the general directions of policy are things shared very widely in this country and in other countries.

Levon Keshishian (Al Ahram, Cairo): Sir, I would like to ask you concerning the membership of Outer Mongolia. One, what is the position of the American Government? Two, is it correct that the American Government is putting pressure on Nationalist China not to veto in order not to anger the Brazzaville countries who will take a resolute position on the question of China?

THE SECRETARY: First, we have indicated that we would under some circumstances consider the admission of Outer Mongolia to the United Nations.

Second, on the question of pressure, when governments consult among themselves in both directions, one sometimes wonders in which direction pressure is being applied. But in any vigorous consultation of a sort which goes on all the time among governments, I would not wish to characterize any particular consultation as pressure.

T. V. Parasuram (Press Trust of India): Could you clarify perhaps by mentioning some names in connection with your reference to an

outstanding world leader to perform the functions of the office of Secretary-General for a temporary period?

THE SECRETARY: Well, there are a number of names of such outstanding world leaders who are under discussion among delegates at the United Nations at the present time. You gentlemen know at least as many of those names as I do.

The United States does not itself have a specific candidate whom we are pressing because we feel this is a matter for very wide consultation. Our principal point is that we think we should settle upon this promptly and put that individual, whoever he is to be, to work fast.

Leo Sauvage (Figaro, Paris): Did the recent Belgrade conference⁸ of uncommitted nations change in any respect the attitude of the United States within or without the United Nations?

THE SECRETARY: The mere fact that a considerable number of countries shared with each other the attribute that they are not specifically aligned with, say, the Soviet bloc on the one side or with the NATO bloc on the other does not in itself mean that they have single views and that the group can be spoken of in group terms. So I would think that our attitude toward the policies and the position of those at Belgrade was mixed before they went there and it was mixed after they came home.

Zivko Milic (Borba, Belgrade): Mr. Secretary, do you think that the Belgrade conference, which was in many quarters interpreted as at least a partial failure—does it appear now in quite a different light, in a more positive light? I have in mind that countries participating in the Belgrade conference stressed the readiness to find and maybe offer a solution for the crisis caused by the death of Mr. Hammarskjold.

THE SECRETARY: I would really wish to appeal to the attitude of the Belgrade participants themselves in not trying to answer a question of that sort about the group as a whole. Many of them made it very clear that they were not there to form a bloc, to establish a single point of view. We have not ourselves characterized that meeting in any way as it applies to the entire meeting. Ob-

⁸ For background, see *ibid.*, Oct. 2, 1961, p. 539.

viously they had some very profitable discussions and they held some talks there that were extremely important, some of them extremely helpful.

But insofar as members at Belgrade believe that the United Nations should not be allowed to become paralyzed by an absence in the office of the Secretary-General, I think they not only are expressing a view that is the general sentiment of the Assembly but are expressing a view with which we are in thorough accord.

Dr. P. G. Krishnayya (P. G. Krishnayya's News Service & Publications, Madras and Benares): Sir, a number of American papers and some Congressmen are carrying a campaign of criticism against India and our troops in the service of the United Nations in the Congo. Since the United States has declared support of the United Nations action, do you disassociate yourself from these attacks? Also, sir, I would like you to answer this question: There have been a number of reports in American papers that the administration will hereafter reduce economic aid to the so-called neutral countries which disagree with United States policies on major questions. Can you comment on this?

THE SECRETARY: Well, first on the question of the United States attitude toward the situation in the Congo, I of course would not wish to associate myself or to in any way become involved with the comments of individual American citizens on a matter of that sort. But let me simply make this statement: that we do welcome the cessation of hostilities in the Katanga and we hope that this current cease-fire agreement can lead to a resumption of efforts by the Government of the Congo and the Congolese leaders in southern Katanga assisted by the United Nations looking toward the peaceful reintegration of the Katanga with the rest of the Congo.⁴ The present cease-fire will permit the United Nations to resume its efforts without further bloodshed toward a full implementation of the United Nations mandate in the Congo. And the United States will continue to offer all appropriate support as requested by the United Nations for the discharge of its mandate in the Congo.

I would think the answer to the second question

⁴ For a Department statement, see *ibid.*, p. 550.

is that we would not expect to withdraw economic aid from neutral countries.

A. Arnold Vas Dias (Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant): Do you believe, sir, that negotiations on the future of Berlin can soon be fruitfully started?

THE SECRETARY: Perhaps we shall be able to answer that question in a few days. I would not try to answer that question today, I am sorry.

The Obligation To Understand the American System of Government

*Remarks by Secretary Rusk*¹

Press release 661 dated September 25

I am happy to introduce today the fourth year of "Continental Classroom" and particularly so since the course which now begins is in American Government. And I may say that it adds to my pleasure that this course is being conducted by Dr. [Peter H.] Odegard, who is an old friend and colleague of mine as well as a distinguished political scientist, teacher, and public servant. I can conceive of few subjects more timely for study these days by a wide American audience than the character of our Government.

At this moment the philosophy upon which that Government rests is being challenged in many places around the world, yet it is still the most powerful influence in the world because men take seriously the simple notion that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Or, to put it more simply, men just do not like to be pushed around too much.

In such a time of continuing conflict, it is imperative that we Americans not merely recognize by name and by instinct the values which we are defending, but that we thoroughly understand them. These values find their expression in the nature of our Government as it has developed

¹ Made on Sept. 25 on the opening program of the National Broadcasting Company's "Continental Classroom."

from our own revolutionary manifesto, the Declaration of Independence, and through the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and through many decisions in courts of law, so that we have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people which we believe we have succeeded in providing in ever greater degree.

Millions of people in other countries think of America as a place where no one need go hungry, where children have shoes, where workingmen own automobiles. It is sad but true that many of these people believe it is these material conditions that we have in mind, rather than any climate of political and social principle, when we speak of our way of life.

It is equally sad, but I think true, that we have ourselves in part to blame for this. We are very apt to fall into ways of thought and speech in which the values of our system are defined in terms of per capita income or tons of steel. How can other peoples understand if we ourselves forget that it is not our material welfare by itself but the fact that we have been able to achieve it alongside of and because of individual liberties which constitutes the glory of our American system?

No Soviet citizen who crosses the borders of the Communist world is unschooled in the dialectic of Marx and Lenin, of Stalin and Khrushchev. The Soviet student who comes to this country under our exchange program and finds himself pressed in argument by the Americans he meets is crammed to his fingertips with answers to the questions which challenge his Communist faith. They may be wrong answers to us, but he believes them. He has been schooled in these answers from the nursery. But sometimes our own students, and older travelers as well, find themselves at a loss under similar cross-questioning by a Soviet group.

How can this happen? It happens ironically because our own free system does not insist that every citizen be competent in political theory, even in the theory of the Government of his own country, because our own free citizens sometimes have not themselves thought through these basic questions. Such questions as what is it in this country that is really of enduring value? And why are we proud to be what we are—Americans? The fact is that we take for granted a great deal

which is taken for granted by few other people.

For example, we have recently come peacefully through a great national election which found the Nation divided in almost equal halves over issues on which millions on both sides had deep convictions. We take this peaceful outcome for granted, regardless of which candidate or party we voted for, and we know it will be just as orderly next time. But in many countries in the world no one knows when he will have an opportunity to make a free electoral choice, and in many others the next election when it does come will be the certain signal for much violence, for military plots and efforts to determine the outcome by force. Those who live as we do, secure in the expectation of peaceful political change, are a small minority among people.

Just as we take our elections for granted, so we are apt to take for granted other manifestations of those rights which we hold to be inalienable but which relatively few governments in any era, in any time, have had both the will and the power to assure. The ideas upon which our nation was founded and upon which it continues to grow are our most precious national resource; and ideas, like other resources, are valid only so long as men and women use them and live by them. Ideas need exercise if they are to continue strong.

To be an American today, more than ever, is to know the ideas that have made America what it is, to know what it is that we stand for in this time of worldwide conflict. Few of us can fail to gain from a study of our Government today, and I think that most of us can gain a great deal.

I hope that many Americans will avail themselves of the opportunity which this course with Dr. Odegard offers. I know Dr. Odegard to be a fine teacher and an exceptional man. He is not only a highly respected scholar but a man of broad practical experience in government in such capacities as assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, consultant to the Atomic Energy Commission, and member of the National Commission for UNESCO [United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization]. It is his belief, which I wholly share, that we Americans have an obligation to know our Government by consent, to understand how it functions, and to be able to defend its principles and to appraise its practice and performance both at home and abroad.

U.S. Replies to Soviet Complaint on Flight of West German Planes

Following is an exchange of notes between the United States and the Soviet Union concerning two aircraft of the Federal Republic of Germany which landed at Tegel Airport in Berlin on September 14.

U.S. NOTE OF SEPTEMBER 26¹

The Embassy of the United States of America presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and has the honor to refer to the latter's note No. 94/OSA of September 17, 1961, with regard to which the Embassy, upon the instructions of its government, is authorized to state the following.

In its note, the Ministry refers to the landing of two F-84 jet aircraft of the Armed Forces of the Federal Republic of Germany at Tegel Airport in Berlin on September 14, 1961.

As soon as the Allied authorities were aware of this landing, the Soviet representative at the Berlin Air Safety Center was informed of the circumstances in which this regrettable incident occurred. The facts of the case prove, without any possibility of error, that the two planes lost their way. Finding themselves short of fuel, the planes sent out distress signals to which only the air control post at Templehof replied. Under these circumstances, the latter could take no other measure than to let these aircraft land on one of the closest airfields—that of the Berlin-Tegel. Furthermore, in the exercise of their rights and responsibilities, the French authorities immediately detained the pilots and the planes and proceeded to investigate the matter. The investigation confirmed the information stated above.

Under these circumstances, the United States Government is surprised that the Government of the U.S.S.R. finds it possible to talk of "provocations," "execution of warlike mission," including "the delivery of atomic bombs to their target."

The Government of the United States considers

¹ Delivered to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs by the U.S. Embassy at Moscow on Sept. 26 (press release 663). Similar notes were delivered by the British and French Embassies at Moscow on the same date.

it necessary to point out to the Soviet Government that, in recent weeks, numerous aerial incursions on the part of Soviet armed forces have taken place over the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany. These incursions were brought to the attention of the Soviet authorities by the responsible military authorities. No one thought of characterizing them as "provocations," or announcing retaliatory measures, which the Soviet Government threatens to take.

It appears to the Government of the United States that at the present time, more than ever, Governments should avoid complicating, by unfounded accusations, those incidents which inevitably occur. Only in this way will they be able to limit to proper proportions such difficulties as may arise from a crisis for which the Government of the United States is in no way responsible.

The tranquillity and security of peoples, to which the Soviet note refers, depend on the desire for peace of the Governments that lead them. The United States Government, like the Governments with which it is allied, has never deviated from this course. It hopes that the Government of the U.S.S.R. will devote itself to working in the same direction.

SOVIET NOTE OF SEPTEMBER 17²

Unofficial translation

On September 14, 1961, at 17 hours 08 minutes Moscow time, two military jet aircraft, model F-84, bearing recognition markings of the Federal Republic of Germany Bundeswehr, penetrated the territory of the German Democratic Republic in the area of the populated point of Elend (75 kilos southwest of Magdeburg).

Passing over the cities of Thale and Quedlinburg at an altitude of 6,000 meters, the aircraft then assumed an altitude of 9,000 meters, and, in the area south of the city of Stassfurt, entered the strip of the air corridor Berlin-Frankfurt-on-Main. The violator aircraft followed this corridor to the area west of Treuenbrietzen, where, sharply losing altitude, they turned northeast and, at 17 hours 29 minutes, landed at the French military airport of Tegel in West Berlin.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and the occupation authorities of the Western Powers are trying to depict this brazen diversion as the consequence of "technical troubles". The French representative in the

² Delivered to the U.S. Embassy at Moscow on Sept. 17 by the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Similar notes were delivered to the British and French Embassies on the same date.

Berlin Air Safety Center (BASC) stated that the Bundeswehr aircraft were in West Berlin because of "loss of orientation" and had landed at the French military airport with the permission of the occupation authorities. According to the version launched by official representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, the aircraft under reference, returning from NATO maneuvers in France, lost their way because of a "thunderstorm", "malfunctioning of cabin instruments", and "lack of experience of the pilots", and, "inasmuch as the fuel was low, descended to earth and coincidentally landed at the West Berlin airport of Tegel".

All these so-called "distracting statements" were designed to deceive public opinion and cover tracks. The question concerns nothing more than a previously prepared provocation, the purpose of which is plain: to strain the situation in the world to the limit and kill in embryo any possibility of agreement between interested states on mature international problems.

The flight plan and its fulfillment by the crews of the aircraft completely refute the assertion about malfunctioning of cabin instruments and other tales about the aviators from the Bundeswehr having gone astray. Two-way radio communication was maintained between the West German airplanes, which flew more than 200 kilos (including more than 150 kilos in the Berlin-Frankfurt-on-Main corridor) over the territory of the German Democratic Republic, and the airport at Tegel. The complicated maneuvering in course and altitude, the coordination of movement of both aircraft, and their precise guidance to the Tegel airport, could not have been accomplished with malfunctioning radio-navigational equipment.

It was not the Bundeswehr pilots who "lost their orientation", but the highly placed military and political leaders of Western Germany and those who stand behind them. It was their hand, accomplished in every sort of subversive actions, which maliciously sent military aircraft, which are intended not for pleasure flights but for the accomplishment of military tasks, including the delivery of atomic bombs to their target, deep into the territory of a sovereign state.

The reckless adventure of sending two fighter bombers of the Bundeswehr through the airspace of the German Democratic Republic is one of the most dangerous provocations which have been committed on the routes of communication with West Berlin and in West Berlin

itself by militaristic circles of the Federal Republic of Germany with the support of the occupation authorities of the Western Powers. It is understandable that the Soviet Government cannot disregard these facts.

The Government of the United States of America has recently more than once made statements about the duty of all states to refrain from any acts which increase tension and the threat to international peace. However, unfortunately, there are not a few evidences of the fact that the Government of the United States of America does not attach great significance to its own appeals. American occupation authorities not only have not taken any steps to suppress the subversive activity of the Federal Republic of Germany in West Berlin, but, as is apparent, are ready to place the air corridors in West Berlin at the disposal of militarists and revanchists.

Even if it were granted that the American authorities might not have known of the provocation which had been prepared, which in and of itself is improbable, could that dispel the anxiety of the peoples of the fate of peace in Europe, with which the West German militarists are irresponsibly playing? The United States of America, France, and Britain, rearming the Federal Republic of Germany, frequently boast that they somehow are in complete control of the situation. Living in a world of such illusions, the Western Powers, however, could find themselves drawn into a devastating war against their own wills.

Declaring a most resolute protest to the Government of the United States of America in connection with the grossest aggressive act, violation of the airspace of the German Democratic Republic by military aircraft of the Bundeswehr and their flight through the air corridors to West Berlin, the Soviet Government warns that, in the future, in similar cases, military violator-warplanes, which do not submit to a demand to land at a designated place, will be destroyed by the use of all means, including rockets.

The intensifying provocative sallies of militarists and revanchists of the Federal Republic of Germany once more with all persuasiveness show how mature has become the necessity of the conclusion of a German peace treaty and normalization on that basis of the situation in West Berlin in order to protect the tranquillity and security of peoples.

Moscow, September 17, 1961

A Pacific Partnership

by Walter P. McConaughy
Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs¹

I consider it a great privilege to have been invited to address this sixth biennial Conference of Japan-American Mayors and Chamber of Commerce Presidents.

Ten years ago, when the first of these conferences was held in Tokyo, we did not hear much talk about people-to-people diplomacy. But a farsighted group of municipal officials on both sides of the Pacific realized, a short 6 years after the end of the Pacific war, that Japan and the United States were destined to become partners in progress for a better life for both peoples. Translating this thought to action, they started one of the most vital and most effective manifestations of people-to-people diplomacy among the many that have since grown up between our two countries. The impressive vitality of your organization is symbolic of the great vitality that today infuses all aspects of Japanese-American relations.

I should like to convey to you today my observations on the present state of this Pacific partnership. To understand this relationship, I should like first to view it against the panorama of eastern Asia as a whole, starting about a century ago. (You will recall that only last year we observed the centennial celebrations of Japanese-United States diplomatic relations.²) Nearly a century ago, then, a fundamental revolution began in Asia. It began, perhaps, as a defensive reaction against the impact of the West but soon became something much greater. It became, and is now, a popular revolution. The peoples of the Pacific are determined to win for themselves freedom—political

and social freedom, but equally important and necessary, freedom from grinding poverty, freedom from ignorance and illiteracy, freedom from disease, freedom from hunger.

The Challenge of Communism

Seen in the perspective of history, I believe it is fair to say that this revolution has entered into a critical phase. The people of Asia have become impatient for rapid fulfillment of their aspirations. At the same time a new challenge has been added to the tremendous political, economic, and social difficulties in the path of the fulfillment of the revolution. This challenge is the claim that only communism can meet the material aspirations of the world's peoples. What is not mentioned in this deceptive Communist propaganda is that it is predicated on the sacrifice of the aspirations for freedom and for the recognition of the dignity of the individual.

In this picture of Asia in ferment, Japan offers a focus of solid encouragement, a confirmation of faith that man, however impatient for the good things of life for his children, need not sacrifice his liberty.

Japan is in the vanguard of this revolution in Asia. Having achieved equality with the technologically advanced nations, and sharing the values of an open society, Japan is moving forward to a new stage of growth and progress. Japan is the equal partner, politically as well as economically, of the nations of the world sharing the same dedication to freedom, the same conviction as to the importance and dignity of the individual. Japan has established a firm base for democracy, for the exercise of the traditional liberties, and for the enjoyment of the opportunities that freedom yields. In particular, an entirely new kind

¹ Address made before the Conference of Japan-American Mayors and Chamber of Commerce Presidents at Portland, Oreg., on Sept. 18 (press release 639).

² For background, see BULLETIN of May 9, 1960, p. 744; May 23, 1960, p. 826; and June 6, 1960, p. 909.

of relationship has developed between Japan and the United States, an across-the-board partnership in which the two countries are working in concert toward goals impossible for either country to achieve alone.

It is as significant as it is relevant that Japan has been singled out by the Communist powers for special attention, special threats, particularly in the recent period. The pace of Japan's progress in freedom is a vital challenge to the Communist system of life under coercion.

The sudden callous resumption by the Soviet Union of nuclear explosions in the atmosphere reminds us that this new type of relationship, this interdependence, has grown up in the era of the cold war. Some aspects of the relationship which has grown up between Japan and the United States are responsive to the threat posed by communism. We have, for instance, a special security relationship with Japan. Nevertheless, mutual security is only one part of the partnership between Japan and the United States. The United States-Japan partnership is based on common objectives in the unfinished revolution for a better world, a world of peace and a world of prosperity and tranquillity. It is not dependent on outside stimulus; it will last long after the worldwide Communist offensive has vanished.

Two-Way Street of Consultation

In the political field the concept of the partnership involves first and foremost the idea of the dialog, the two-way street of consultation between the leaders of our respective governments. The emphasis here, as in any true partnership, has to be placed upon the necessity, at all times, for a completely frank, uninhibited exchange of views. This is perhaps best illustrated by the recently concluded visit to Washington of Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda.³ Mr. Ikeda did not come to the United States because there existed some urgent problem in relations between the two countries which could be settled only by a meeting of President and Prime Minister. Happily, there are no such problems in our relations with Japan. On the contrary, Mr. Ikeda came here at the invitation of President Kennedy so that the two might consult together not only on bilateral matters, such as trade and economic relations, but also on the

major questions that face the world today, such as Berlin, the forthcoming session of the General Assembly, and disarmament. All of these issues were discussed in an atmosphere of mutual confidence, which is the hallmark of the United States-Japan partnership.

These talks were fruitful in many ways, and from them have emerged a series of new and potentially very useful institutions. Perhaps the most important of them is the new Joint United States-Japan Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs, a body which will consist of our Secretaries of State, Commerce, Treasury, Agriculture, Interior, and Labor and their Japanese ministerial counterparts, who will meet alternately in Japan and in the United States. Their first meeting will be held in Japan in November of this year. This Committee will be the senior coordinating group for all of the partnership's trade and economic affairs, including such matters as balance of payments between the two countries, the flow of investments and dividends, trade relationships with other countries, and assistance to newly emerging countries. This Committee will also be the forum for discussion of such matters as Japan's need to expand its trade abroad and its access to a reasonable share of the American market and also Japan's ability to liberalize conditions for entry into its own internal market for American and other products. You might sum up the role of the joint Economic Committee in these words: It will view the totality of Japanese-American trade and economic relations, will plan for their future, and will attempt to iron out any rough spots as they arise.

A second institution to emerge from the Ikeda-Kennedy talks was a joint committee on cultural matters, to be made up of outstanding figures from the academic and intellectual worlds of the two nations. Both our cultures are exceptionally rich and varied, and each has much to contribute to the other. We expect this committee to survey the entire field of cultural relations between the United States and Japan—the official exchange programs such as those established under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt acts, the programs of the various private foundations, and the more informal relationships which have grown up between Japanese and American universities and learned societies. The joint committee will explore all of these aspects of Japanese-American cultural rela-

³ *Ibid.*, July 10, 1961, p. 57.

tions. In this concept we have in mind no mere homogenization of the two cultures, for that would make each lose something of its own identity and vital spirit. Nor have we in mind a simple numerical increase in the number of scholars traveling between Japan and the United States. Instead, what we are aiming at is a joint venture to explore the values and wellsprings of our respective cultures, to examine their impact upon each other, and to enlarge the contribution each can make to the enrichment of the other.

Another outgrowth of the Washington talks is the establishment of a Joint United States-Japan Scientific Committee, which will meet later this year to mark out areas in the sciences in which Japanese and American scientists can fruitfully assist each other. This will involve not only the investigation of methods by which we can more profitably exchange information—perhaps through entities like an institute for the translation of scientific papers and literature—but also actual joint projects in which Japanese and American scientists can work side by side. We have already in the planning stage two joint Japanese-American ventures in outer space: one a communications satellite project, and the other a radiation measuring rocket probe. We expect the Scientific Committee will explore other areas on the frontier of man's knowledge in which our scientists can collaborate to our mutual benefit.

This, then, is a sketch of the kind of institutional framework which we have been creating for this new venture in interdependence. But what I have so far described is only the skeleton; muscle and sinew will have to be added. These committees, and the several other bodies created in the past, will achieve substance when the people of both countries, acting in bodies such as this conference, will lend their advice, assistance, and continuing support.

I think we have to recognize that this is not going to be an easy undertaking. Differences of language, culture, and customs present formidable obstacles to understanding. I am convinced, however, that there are enough men in both countries who are willing to take the trouble to cross the language barrier, who are willing to work and persevere to build a partnership, and who are willing to solve problems as they arise by joint action in a spirit of mutuality and cooperation. I believe that a partnership of this kind, actively

shared and nourished by citizens of both countries, can be fruitful beyond all expectations.

Japan's 10-Year Economic Plan

I note with great satisfaction that the Japanese Government has recently embarked upon a 10-year economic plan to double the national income and thus to raise the living standards of the Japanese people to a level among the very highest in the world. I cannot stress emphatically enough the tremendous significance of this plan, not only because whatever affects the economic health of one of our best customers will sooner or later affect our own but also because of the example which will be set for less developed nations to follow. The essential, harrowing question of our time is this: "Is individual freedom consistent with rapid economic growth?" I am confident that Japan, one of the four leading industrial complexes of the world, is already providing an affirmative answer to this central question.

Our stake in this bold venture undertaken by Japan is very nearly as great as that of Japan itself. We Americans understand that Japan cannot succeed in this undertaking unless she can achieve access on reasonable terms to a fair share of the market in the United States and elsewhere in the free world. I do not mean, of course, that we have any intention of driving American manufacturers out of business, and I do not mean that we intend to encourage any mass invasion of America by Japanese products. But I do mean that we have a real, a very great interest in seeing to it that Japan expands its market. In return our Japanese friends will surely recognize their obligation to dismantle as rapidly as possible the remaining quantitative controls over imports into Japan. If we continue to approach this problem in a spirit of good will and understanding on both sides, as I am sure we shall, there is every reason to expect that the results will be mutually satisfactory and in the general interest.

There is, finally, another highly significant area for future action by the Japanese-American partnership that I wish to call to your attention—the challenge posed by the large number of newly independent and economically less developed nations of the world. As we all know, the United States is vitally interested in assisting these nations and has devoted several tens of billions of dollars to this purpose. Japan, as an Asian na-

tion and as the only Asian nation which has thus far created a modern, industrialized economy, also has much to offer to these new nations. Japan's possession of the most vigorously expanding economy in the entire world gives her a position of considerable authority from which to speak. There is thus a vital and unique contribution which Japan can make, in terms of technical assistance and advice, as well as in terms of money and capital equipment. Operating in conjunction with one another, the efforts of each reinforcing and complementing those of the other, the partnership of Japan and the United States can effectively meet this great challenge of the decade in a manner which would be impossible for either acting alone.

Building Toward the World of Tomorrow

In the past 16 years many strong links have been forged between our two nations. This important conference is a shining example of such enduring, valuable, and far-reaching links. Our peoples and our cultures have their destinies so comingled that separation would only impoverish both nations. We share the same road to the future. Our journey along this road will not be without danger, hazard, or challenge. But I am certain that the combined strength, wisdom, and determination of your countrymen and mine will be worthy of any trials which we may face and that together we shall be able not only to surpass the demands of this troubled age but to contribute most significantly toward the transition to a safer and happier one.

Those developmental forces which over the past century have so insistently, precipitately, and perhaps prematurely juxtaposed the world's peoples have vastly exacerbated the problems of their relationships. Those same forces, however, have also afforded the most remarkable tools—in transportation and communication, in medicine, education, and pedagogy—for the solution of those

problems. The four industrial centers of the world possess these tools in great abundance, but the manner of their use will make all the difference in the nature of our future life on this planet.

The ideology of Communist countries was conceived and born in the early days of the industrial revolution which has presented mankind with both problem and promise in such overwhelming plenty. These Communist nations have for the most part clung to a dogmatic answer to both problem and promise, geared to limited understanding of the social dislocations which in those early days were attendant upon industrialization. Their achievements have been too much impelled by fear and hate, implemented by ruthless regimentation, and put to the services of a type of power politics which the world must rapidly outgrow if it is to survive in safety.

In this situation it is of crucial importance to all mankind that the other great industrial centers of the world, Japan, Western Europe, and the United States, use the powerful tools of the modern world in the most enlightened manner and for the most constructive national and world purposes—and in as much concert as appears practicable—in building toward the world of tomorrow.

The United States-Japan partnership, therefore, important as it is intrinsically, is also important to the future of millions of people who may scarcely be aware of its reality. I am confident that our two peoples and their leaders will measure up to our responsibilities inherent in this larger context as well.

In conclusion I am very glad to convey to you, on behalf of the United States, the expression of our complete confidence that this partnership—a partnership of peoples as well as of governments—will grow and prosper in the years ahead and will become one of the most steadfast foundations of progress, friendship, and peace in the world.

Southern Africa in Transition

by G. Mennen Williams
Assistant Secretary for African Affairs¹

Ladies and gentlemen, before taking up the text of what I had prepared for you tonight, I must take note of a very great tragedy which has befallen us all in the death of Secretary-General [Dag] Hammarskjold of the United Nations. His plane, as you know, crashed in Northern Rhodesia as it was carrying him on a mission of peace and conciliation.

The United Nations and the Government of the Congo have for more than a year sought to maintain the integrity of the Congolese nation against separatist and secessionist movements. A crisis, unfortunately involving violence, has lately erupted over this issue in the Katanga province.² It was on his way to meet Mr. [Moishe] Tshombe, the leader of Katanga, that the Secretary-General met an untimely death.

Our grief is profound tonight. But if Mr. Hammarskjold is lost to the United Nations and the world, it is our hope that his mission of conciliation will be energetically pursued and the U.N. will succeed soon in restoring Congolese unity.

Just lately my wife and I have returned from an extensive trip in Africa, the second since President Kennedy appointed me to my present duties in the Department of State.³ I have now visited 14 of the independent countries of Africa and 12 of the dependent territories. Two more trips this

¹ Address made before the Negro Trade Union Leadership Council at Philadelphia, Pa., on Sept. 18 (press releases 641 and 641A).

² BULLETIN of Oct. 2, 1961, p. 550.

³ For an address made by Assistant Secretary Williams in Salisbury, Federation of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, on Aug. 25, see *ibid.*, Oct. 9, 1961, p. 600.

year will cover all the remaining nations and the principal territories, excepting the Republic of South Africa, where there wasn't a mutually convenient time for a visit.

Let me tell you something of my findings in this most recent trip.

Our point of departure was the Republic of the Ivory Coast, a country of 3 million people situated in the great rain-forest arc which extends along the western bulge of the continent. We were there to help celebrate the first anniversary of the independence of the Ivory Coast. It was my great privilege to join with Attorney General Robert Kennedy, with John H. Johnson, the distinguished Negro publisher from Chicago, and with our Ambassador to the Ivory Coast, R. Borden Reams, in representing the U.S. Government at these ceremonies. I wish time permitted my telling you of the tremendous spirit of these good people, about their beautiful and modern capital city, and about the example of progress they have set in their first year of independence. There is a lesson, too, in the now cordial and mutually beneficial relationship between the people of the Ivory Coast and of France. You will have to take my word for it that these things speak volumes about the promise of Africa's future.

Then we traveled to southern Africa. Here we visited two more of the 18 African countries which have come to independence since the beginning of 1960—the Republic of Gabon in west Africa and the Malagasy Republic on the island of Madagascar. Both are flourishing countries which are moving steadily forward under responsible governments. I think the world can expect much from both of them.

Tonight, however, I'd like to deal mainly with the dependent territories which lie to the south

of the Republic of the Congo. Much of this area has been attractive to European settlement for some 400 years, and here we find the highest relative white population in sub-Saharan Africa, running up to about 25 percent in the Republic of South Africa. In the Congo and to the north the big question is the political and economic development of now-independent nations, whereas to the south the big question is the extension of the franchise to black Africans in areas with sizable white minorities. Two of these areas, Angola and Mozambique, are vast territories administered by Portugal. The other six are under British administration and reflect great contrasts. Let me begin by discussing these British areas.

Bechuanaland, Basutoland, Swaziland

Least developed are three territories which are only beginning to impinge on the preoccupied mind of America and much of the rest of the world. These are Bechuanaland and Swaziland, which lie along the borders of the Republic of South Africa, and Basutoland, which lies wholly within South Africa. Together they hold a population of 1½ millions, of whom 11,000 are whites. Bechuanaland is larger than Texas but appears to be poorly favored in natural endowments. Basutoland has voted for its own self-government under British protection with all men having an equal vote. Swaziland is working on a new constitution giving more black African participation, and Bechuanaland, too, is moving forward. We shall certainly hear more about this trend, not least because of its contrast with the retrogressive political and social philosophy of *apartheid* being practiced in neighboring South Africa.

The Rhodesias and Nyasaland

The most developed, the most complex, and the most challenging territories we visited are Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland. Here are three rather well defined territories, each in a different stage of political evolution, each affected by a different balance between the races and by varying degrees of economic progress, but all linked together in the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. The area is one of considerable economic potential, with great cities, mines, plantations, and factories already well developed. The combined populations total 8,330,000, of which 308,000 are of European stock.

A heated political dialog is taking place in these countries, between the black African majorities along with some white liberals on the one hand and the bulk of the white minority on the other. The British Government is presiding over the debate and tempering its passions. Let me say here that British administrators have done much to encourage African advancement, political education, and progressive evolution toward the goals of democratic self-government by all the people and an interracial society.

The goal of self-government by all the people is acknowledged to be right by all responsible elements in the three territories. The subject of the dialog, then, is the rate, the speed of transition to majority rule. The political party of Sir Roy Welensky, with strong white support particularly in Southern Rhodesia, believes in a gradual pace. Northern Rhodesia tends to be more progressive and is working on a new constitution. The African nationalist parties of Dr. Banda, Kenneth Kaunda, and Joshua Nkomo are pressing for constitutional changes which would give full voice, at the earliest date, to the black African majorities. Dr. Banda has of course now achieved self-government for the black majority in Nyasaland under British protection.

Inevitably tension has accompanied this great debate. Lately there has been sporadic violence in Northern Rhodesia, where many African nationalists feel they have been denied adequate progress under a proposed new constitution. Just last week the British Government announced at least a partial reopening of this question.

Racial Accommodation

In the Rhodesias and Nyasaland there is a problem *within* a problem. Besides constitutional transition there is the vital process of accommodation between races, of building a truly democratic interracial society. This goal is acknowledged by all responsible parties and has constitutional support. A good beginning and much progress has been achieved, but again the difficulty and the argument are about the pace of progress.

The success of an interracial society in the Rhodesias and Nyasaland has tremendous bearing on what is going to happen in the way of black African participation in government in Angola, Mozambique, and the Republic of South Africa. Consequently America and the world have a great

interest in the successful development of what the Federation calls a partnership policy.

Here we are very close to a subject of intense concern to Americans, who know what is at stake in the question of racial equality. We too have long had the goal of a true interracial society. We have come a greater distance toward this goal, which is set forth in the law of the land and which our Government is pledged to realize. Yet we must be humbly aware how much must yet be done, how many acts of faith and courage will be necessary from our leaders and from all men of good will.

We have stated it as a cornerstone of our foreign policy that we hope for the peoples of Africa what we hope for ourselves in building and perfecting our own society. We must therefore expect those peoples, black and white alike, to observe with very great interest how we are getting on with the job, just as we observe their progress. Your effort here—and ours in Washington—are thus joined.

Let us, on our side, look with understanding on the problems which are being worked out by the peoples and governments of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland. Let us acknowledge that a promising start has been made. And let us wish, for all those concerned, two things: understanding and persistence in moving ahead. I should add that the U.S. Government hopes to be able to assist in a more rapid extension of educational opportunity in the three territories, helping thereby in the preparation for self-government.

Angola and Mozambique

This brings me to Angola and Mozambique. Located on the west coast of Africa, Angola extends south from the Congo border. In size it is larger than Texas and California together, and its population is about 4½ million. Of this number some 250,000 have held Portuguese citizenship. Mozambique, on the east coast, is larger than Texas and has a population of just over 6½ million.

The Portuguese have ruled Angola and Mozambique for more than four centuries, and until 1951 the two territories had the status of colonies. In that year the Government in Lisbon adopted laws under which these colonies became "overseas provinces," and the Portuguese firmly maintain that they are integral parts of Portugal.

This has become a point of controversy in the United Nations, where the last General Assembly adopted a resolution⁴ which includes Portugal among other nations having a responsibility under article 73 of the charter to report to the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories. The Portuguese Government has declared its refusal to comply with this injunction.

This viewpoint of the Portuguese stands in sharp contrast to that of the other principal colonial powers. The British and the French have deliberately pursued a policy of preparing their dependent territories for self-government and eventual independence. That is why the great majority of new African nations have emerged to freedom peacefully. Only in the Congo, which did not enjoy this preparation, has independence been followed by turmoil.

Political self-expression has been possible for the African peoples of Angola and Mozambique only to an extremely limited degree. Until just last month, Portuguese law—the so-called *indigena* law—divided the overseas populations into two categories, "civilized" and "noncivilized." In Angola, for example, the 250,000 persons who were considered "civilized" included only about 30,000 Africans, who had achieved this status under the official policy of "assimilation." To become an *assimilado* an African had to become a Christian and fill certain strict requirements as to education and income. The "noncivilized" millions could not under any circumstances vote or hold office. They lived under state protection and control and were subject to a system of directed labor during part of each year.

Until March of this year Portuguese Africa remained outwardly calm. Then in northern Angola a rebellion broke out and led to great violence and the loss of thousands of lives, both Portuguese and African. Military reinforcements from Portugal have restored control of urban centers in the disputed area, but the end of the fighting is not in sight.

As you probably know, the U.N. General Assembly debated the question of Angola last April. On April 20 the Assembly adopted a resolution⁵ deplored the violence in Angola and calling on the Portuguese to effect reforms leading to self-

⁴ U.N. doc. A/RES/1542 (XV).

⁵ U.N. doc. A/RES/1603 (XV).

determination for the peoples of Angola. An Angola subcommittee was set up to report on the situation. On June 9 the Security Council reaffirmed these views.⁶ The United States voted for both resolutions, which were adopted by large majorities.

In our visit to Angola we saw much evidence of internal tension and we found considerable recognition among the Portuguese of the importance of reforms. Now at the end of August, as much in response to these Portuguese settler views as to the votes in the U.N., a series of reforms have been announced. Most notably, the *indigena* law has been abolished and all inhabitants of Portuguese Africa have been granted constitutional equality. The average African will still be unable to vote and will have little or no participation in government, however, because, as is true for all Portuguese citizens, he must pass a literacy test and comply with a tax proviso. Literacy in Portuguese Africa is well below 10 percent. From this it will be seen that rapid educational advancement is a requisite for full realization of political equality.

The new reforms are of course most welcome from our point of view, and we trust that they will be made politically and socially effective. How greatly they will resolve the issues in conflict I cannot say. Much will depend on the Portuguese estimate of the lateness of the hour in Africa and whether their response is timely and also sufficiently broad. Ambassador Stevenson, speaking in the Security Council last March 15, outlined a frame of reference which we believe is still pertinent, using these words:⁷

The United States would be remiss in its duties as a friend of Portugal if it failed to express honestly its conviction that step-by-step planning within Portuguese territories and its acceleration is now imperative for the successful political and economic and social advancement of all inhabitants under Portuguese administration—advancement, in brief, toward full self-determination.

Angola and Mozambique have real promise for all of their peoples under a progressive evolution, and I sincerely hope that we have now seen the beginning of such an evolution.

⁶ For a statement made by Charles W. Yost, U.S. Representative in the Security Council, and text of a resolution, see BULLETIN of July 10, 1961, p. 88.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Apr. 3, 1961, p. 497.

Attitudes Toward Change

Permit me now, before closing, to touch on one general impression gained in my trip.

In a speech in South Africa early in 1960 Prime Minister Macmillan said that "the wind of change is blowing through the continent." His words were intended to bring reluctant or fearful minds to face up to extending political and civil rights equally to all men.

Since he spoke, 17 new nations have been born to independence in Africa, but in the dependent territories I visited (as well as in the Republic of South Africa, which I have not visited) there are still many influential citizens who would like to believe they can isolate themselves and preserve political privileges with no change, or only very little change. In defense of this attitude they tend to look at the Congo as if what has happened there is typical, when clearly it is the exception to the rule among the newly independent countries.

Unfortunately there are some areas of white African opinion that believe every African nationalist is a Communist and subscribes to a program of exterminating the whites or driving them out. This is obviously untrue. Nationalist leaders by and large welcome white participation in their countries' affairs, recognizing the contribution they can make. It is true, however, that they believe that white Africans must ultimately be content with the same privileges as black Africans.

It is my hope that, increasingly, people will become better informed about and will take heart from the examples of successful independent governments elsewhere in Africa. I should add that our own policies for Africa are very much bound up in this question. To the extent we can help these new governments build up strong and stable societies, we shall be contributing to a relaxation of irrational and potentially dangerous fears. Meanwhile we must also recognize how important it is to see things through to a successful conclusion in the Congo. And always it is important to make our own multiracial society an outstanding success.

My friends, in closing let me say again how important it is that Americans take the kind of interest in Africa that you have shown in establishing this scholarship award. It is a credit to you, to Philadelphia, and to the United States.

If your example is repeated often enough, the future of African-American friendship will be virtually assured.

Assistant Secretary Williams Plans Two More Trips to Africa

The Department of State announced on September 26 (press release 666) that Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs G. Mennen Williams would leave Washington September 29 for Rabat, Morocco. This will be the first stop in his third official trip to Africa since he was appointed by President Kennedy to the Department of State. In addition to Morocco, he will visit Senegal, Mauritania, Mali, Niger, Chad, Tunisia, Libya, and the Sudan between October 1 and 24. Mr. Williams will be accompanied by Mrs. Williams, Department of State aides, and representatives of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and the International Cooperation Administration.

In two separate trips earlier this year, Assistant Secretary Williams visited 16 countries in central Africa as well as 2 independent states and 8 territories in southeast Africa.

Assistant Secretary Williams is making this trip in order to convey personally the good wishes and interest of the United States to the governments and peoples of the north and west African nations and to gain firsthand impressions of the area. He will also consult with members of our embassies and consulates.

A fourth trip is planned to begin on November 27 and continue to December 17, at which time Assistant Secretary Williams will visit west and central African nations which were not included in his previous visits.

CENTO Telecommunications Project Contract Signed

Press release 674 dated September 29

The Department of State announced on September 29 the signing of a telecommunications project contract between the Radio Corporation of

America (RCA) and the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) on behalf of the U.S. Government. The project eventually will link the three regional members of the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan. The signing ceremony took place in the office of D. A. FitzGerald, Deputy Director of Operations for ICA, who signed for the United States. Douglas C. Lynch, vice president of RCA, signed for the company. Among those attending were representatives of the three regional countries and officials of RCA, ICA, and the Department of State.

This occasion marks the start of actual construction on an undertaking which has been the subject of cooperative effort by the United States, Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan for over 3 years, under the sponsorship of CENTO. The project illustrates the peaceful objectives of CENTO as well as CENTO's usefulness as a vehicle for regional collaboration. Four sovereign nations, in partnership, have worked together from the outset in determining the major features of a modern telecommunications system. The system is designed not only to provide communications between Ankara, Tehran, and Karachi but to tie in many other communities. It is designed to take account of existing and future branch lines along the route. The equipment will be owned by the three host countries and operated integrally with their existing telecommunications systems.

The project is a partnership venture in the financial sense also in that the host countries are making large contributions which include providing all of the necessary buildings, several hundred miles of access roads, and cash contributions to cover the local-currency costs of construction. The \$16,490,000 construction contract is financed largely by the United States but also in part by the host countries. The United States is providing all foreign exchange costs for manufacturing the equipment, and for its installation and testing.

The 3,000-mile CENTO telecommunications system will be one of the longest microwave systems in the world. When completed it will contribute importantly to the realization of one of CENTO's principal economic objectives—the improvement of communications between the countries of the region.

Ambassador Harriman Visits Southeast Asia

Following are departure statements made by Ambassador at Large W. Averell Harriman on September 18 at Rangoon and on September 20 at Vientiane. Ambassador Harriman was visiting southeast Asia to discuss further with Asian leaders matters relating to the International Conference for the Settlement of the Laotian Question, which convened at Geneva May 16.¹

RANGOON

The talks which His Highness Prince Souvanna Phouma and I have had during the past 3 days have been frank and useful and have given us an opportunity to discuss the wide range of subjects of mutual concern. We agreed that our common objective is a truly neutral and sovereign Laos, independent of all outside interferences, to be achieved by peaceful means.

We discussed the various issues being negotiated at the 14-nation conference at Geneva, and I found a considerable measure of understanding between us. There are a number of points now unresolved in Geneva which can only be settled after the arrival of a united delegation representing a government of national unity. Parallel of the conference in Geneva are the negotiations between the three princes for formation of such a government. We agreed on the need for an early successful outcome of these negotiations. In the meantime, both of us stressed the importance of strict observance of a cease-fire by all concerned.

I raised with His Highness the question of the Americans held in Xieng Khouang. He assured me they would be released as soon as the new government was formed and in the meantime could receive letters and packages.

His Highness and I have both expressed to Prime Minister U Nu and his Government our great appreciation for the hospitality and many courtesies which they have shown us during our stay here.

¹ For background, see BULLETIN of May 15, 1961, p. 710; June 5, 1961, p. 844; June 26, 1961, p. 1023; and July 10, 1961, p. 85.

VIENTIANE

During my visit to Laos I have had the honor of being received by His Majesty the King. I had the opportunity to assure him of the President's deep interest in and concern for the future of Laos and of my Government's support for His Majesty and his Government. I expressed the unwavering determination of the United States to assist in the achievement of a truly independent and neutral Laos through peaceful means.

I have had fruitful discussions with His Highness the Prime Minister, Prince Boun Oum; the Deputy Prime Minister, General Phoumi Nosa-van; and members of the Royal Government.

In these meetings we discussed the negotiations going on at the 14-nation conference in Geneva and the parallel discussions among the three princes. We considered together the manner in which our common goal of a peaceful and independent Laos could be reached. I informed His Majesty and the Royal Government fully about my talks in Rangoon with Prince Souvanna Phouma, and I expressed the hope that the three princes could meet soon again to come to an agreement upon a government of national unity.

I am grateful to His Majesty for his graciousness in receiving me and for the warm hospitality and courtesies shown me by members of his Government.

U.S. Makes Additional Quantities of Uranium 235 Available

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY

White House press release (Newport, R.I.) dated September 26

Progress in using atomic energy for peaceful purposes is evident in the numerous national and international programs for scientific research and for the development of nuclear power and other applications. Many of the current projects and those contemplated for the future are based on the use of enriched uranium. I am announcing today a further step by the United States to meet the prospective needs for this material.

I have determined under section 41 b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 that the amount of

enriched uranium to be made available for peaceful uses at home and abroad will be increased to a total of 165,000 kilograms of contained uranium 235. Of this total 100,000 kilograms is to be available for distribution within the United States under section 53 of the Atomic Energy Act and 65,000 kilograms for distribution to other countries under section 54. These amounts have been recommended by the Atomic Energy Commission with the concurrence of the Secretaries of State and Defense. The material will be distributed as required over a period of years and will be subject to prudent safeguards against unauthorized use.

This action increases the amounts of uranium 235 made available by previous determination announced on February 22, 1956,¹ and July 3, 1957.² The new amounts are estimated to cover present commitments and those expected to be made during the next few years under domestic licenses and foreign agreements. The purpose of this announcement is to provide continuing assurance of the availability of enriched uranium for peaceful programs contemplated at home and abroad. As those programs develop in the future, it will undoubtedly be necessary to make further determinations to meet their requirements. The capacity of the United States for producing enriched uranium is sufficient to meet all foreseeable needs for peaceful uses in addition to our defense needs.

A discussion of the new determination is contained in the attached statement by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

**STATEMENT BY GLENN T. SEABORG
CHAIRMAN, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION**

White House press release (Newport, R.I.) dated September 26

The President's announcement today that the amount of enriched uranium to be made available for peaceful uses at home and abroad has been increased to a total of 165,000 kilograms of contained uranium 235 is an important step in the advancement of peaceful applications of atomic energy. Of this total, the 100,000 kilograms for distribution within the United States and the

65,000 kilograms for distribution to other countries were recommended by the Atomic Energy Commission to cover existing commitments and those expected to be made during the next few years under domestic licenses and foreign agreements, including materials for research, test, and power reactors. The availability of material for peaceful uses in AEC's own facilities is not part of this determination.

The last Presidential determination was announced on July 3, 1957, and brought the total of material available to 100,000 kilograms of uranium 235, divided equally between domestic and foreign uses. As explained by the AEC at that time, the 100,000-kilogram figure was in units of equivalent output of highly enriched uranium from United States production plants. However, most of the uranium to be made available will not be highly enriched in uranium 235, and the domestic licenses and foreign agreements are in terms of kilograms of uranium 235 actually contained in the material supplied. Therefore, for simplicity, the new determination is expressed in kilograms of *contained* uranium 235. The total of 165,000 kilograms of contained uranium 235 to be available is estimated as the production equivalent of about 140,000 kilograms of uranium 235 in highly enriched material, so that the new determination represents an increase of 40 percent over the previous total.

The Presidential determination of enriched uranium to be available for peaceful uses is based on anticipated needs for present projects and those expected to start during the next few years. On earlier occasions the foreign and domestic requirements were estimated to be about equal, and thus the quantities of material determined to be available for domestic and foreign distribution were identical or nearly so. The fact that more enriched uranium presently is being made available for domestic than foreign uses reflects, for the moment at least, a somewhat more rapid increase in the domestic needs of nuclear industry for enriched uranium than in the foreign needs but does not necessarily establish a precedent for future determinations. As new requirements for enriched uranium develop with expanded use of atomic energy at home and abroad, the quantity of material to be made available for distribution by the AEC will be reexamined periodically.

¹ BULLETIN of Mar. 19, 1956, p. 469.

² *Ibid.*, July 22, 1957, p. 146.

Allocation of enriched uranium to a reactor project includes material for the fuel loading, for fuel consumption over the period of the domestic license or foreign agreement, and for the "pipeline" associated with the manufacture and storage of fuel elements, cooling and shipment of irradiated fuel, and chemical processing of irradiated fuel to recover special nuclear material. The amount of uranium 235 contained in enriched uranium returned to the AEC is deducted from the amount supplied by the AEC in computing how much is available for further distribution. The material allocated to a reactor project may not be completely distributed for several decades.

As of June 30, 1961, there were in effect in the United States construction permits or operating licenses for 10 power reactors, 3 test reactors, 69 research reactors, and 14 critical-experiment facilities, in addition to 409 special nuclear material licenses for uses other than in reactors or critical-experiment facilities. Agreements for cooperation in the civil uses of atomic energy are in effect between the United States and a large part of the free world, including 38 countries and West Berlin; 14 of these agreements provide for cooperation on power reactors. In addition, agreements are in effect with the International Atomic Energy Agency and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM).

Enriched uranium for peaceful purposes is distributed abroad only under agreements for cooperation in the civil uses of atomic energy. These agreements are of two general types: those providing for the transfer of modest amounts of material for power as well as research and test reactors. All such agreements for cooperation contain a guarantee by the cooperating country that the material supplied will be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. Safeguard provisions allowing inspection of materials, facilities, and records by United States or international inspectors are also included, as appropriate.

The uranium 235 content of enriched uranium distributed abroad is normally limited to 20 percent. However, uranium containing up to 90 percent uranium 235 may be made available for research and test reactors and reactor experiments. Agreements providing for the transfer of such highly enriched uranium for these purposes or for the transfer of enriched uranium for power re-

actors contain comprehensive safeguard provisions. Agreements covering only the transfer of uranium containing up to 20 percent uranium 235 for research reactors contain more limited safeguard provisions.

Import Restrictions on Tung Oil and Tung Nuts To Be Studied

White House press release dated September 18

Following is the text of a letter from President Kennedy to the Members of the U.S. Tariff Commission.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1961

DEAR SIRS: I have been advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that there is reason to believe that the circumstances requiring the provisions of Proclamation No. 3378 of October 27, 1960,¹ issued pursuant to Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, which extends for three years commencing November 1, 1960, the import restrictions on tung oil and tung nuts, no longer exist and that such provisions may now be terminated.

It is requested that the Tariff Commission make a supplemental investigation under Section 22(d) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, to determine whether the circumstances requiring said provisions of the aforementioned Proclamation no longer exist and such provisions may now be terminated.

The Commission's report of findings and recommendations should be submitted as soon as practicable.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY

Honorable JOSEPH E. TALBOT
Honorable J. ALLEN OVERTON, JR.
Honorable WALTER F. SCHREIBER
Honorable GLENN W. SUTTON
Honorable WILLIAM E. DOWLING
*United States Tariff Commission
Washington, D.C.*

¹ For text, see BULLETIN of Nov. 28, 1960, p. 835.

President Signs Bill Creating U.S. Disarmament Agency

Remarks by President Kennedy¹

With the signing of H.R. 9118 there is created the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.² This act symbolizes the importance the United States places on arms control and disarmament in its foreign policy.

The creation for the first time by act of Congress of a special organization to deal with arms control and disarmament matters emphasizes the high priority that attaches to our efforts in this direction. Our ultimate goal, as the act points out, is a world free from war and free from the dangers and burdens of armaments, in which the use of force is subordinated to the rule of law and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully.

It is a complex and difficult task to reconcile through negotiation the many security interests of all nations to achieve disarmament, but the establishment of this Agency will provide new and better tools for this effort.

I am pleased and heartened by the bipartisan support this bill enjoyed in the Congress. The leaders of both political parties gave encouragement and assistance. The new Agency brings renewed hope for agreement and progress in the critical battle for the survival of mankind.

I want to express my thanks to the Members of the Congress—particularly who are here—who were specially interested. I am extremely sorry that Senator [Hubert H.] Humphrey, who was a particularly vigorous proponent of this legislation for many years in the Senate, is obliged to remain in Washington. And I want to add a special word of thanks to Mr. [John J.] McCloy, the disarmament adviser, who has given this entire matter his most constant attention.

¹ Made at New York, N.Y., on Sept. 26 (White House (New York) press release).

² For background, see BULLETIN of July 17, 1961, p. 99; Sept. 4, 1961, p. 412; and Sept. 18, 1961, p. 492.

I want to take this opportunity to announce that the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency set up by this legislation will be Mr. William Foster. He has been a consultant to Mr. McCloy in preparing the American plan which has been submitted to the United Nations General Assembly yesterday,³ and he and a group have been working for many months, full time, on this most important assignment.

I think that Mr. Salinger [Pierre Salinger, White House Press Secretary] can give this afternoon to any members of the press some of the biographical material. Mr. Foster has been a distinguished public servant for many years as a most active and leading official in the Marshall plan. He is a Republican, and I think his appointment indicates the bipartisan, national concern of both parties—and really, in a sense, all Americans—for this effort to disarm mankind with adequate safeguards.

So I want to express our appreciation to you, Mr. Foster, for taking on this assignment, and Mr. Salinger perhaps can fill in some of the details. Mr. Foster, as Director of this, has the rank of an Under Secretary of State, and his work will be most closely coordinated with the Secretary of State, with me and the White House, and with our representatives in the General Assembly.

Department Opposes Tariff on Lead and Zinc

*Statement by Edwin M. Martin
Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs¹*

The subject of this statement is S. 1747, a bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc.

The Department of State testified before the Subcommittee on Minerals, Metals, and Fuels of

¹ See p. 650.

² Read before the Senate Finance Committee by Sidney B. Jacques, Director, Office of International Resources, on Sept. 20 (press release 648).

the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on one version of this bill.² Since that time the bill has been amended with respect to the subsidy provisions to reduce the price base for determining the subsidy but to increase the number of producers eligible for the stabilization payments, as well as the quantity upon which each may receive payments. The provisions which would raise the taxes on imported lead and zinc concentrates and metal and on numerous products are the same as originally proposed in S. 1747.

The Department of State, together with the other interested departments and agencies of this administration, recommended against the passage of this legislation and continues to be strongly opposed to its enactment. We believe that the program would prejudice the broader interests of the United States both in the development of its own economy and foreign trade and in its political relations with other countries.

The Department of State is keenly aware of the problems of this industry, especially in the areas where mines have declined, smelters have closed, and communities have experienced unemployment and business losses. The lead and zinc markets have been plagued by surpluses, caused primarily by reduced demand for these products, which has resulted in low prices. This condition of the industry has resulted from a number of different causes, including overexpansion induced by World War II, the Korean emergency, and the stockpiling program. In addition it is suffering from the difficulties that all mining industries experience when ore bodies that were once economic become marginal because the quality of the ore declines or markets shift or newer, lower cost supplies are developed. At the same time the markets for lead and zinc in the United States have declined from their 1955 peak due to inroads made by competitive materials and by changes in consumer taste—such as the development of the compact automobile.

Recognizing these problems, the administration was prepared to consider a subsidy to small miners to help them over this difficult period. The terms of such a subsidy were outlined by the Department of the Interior. It would provide stabilization payments for up to 750 tons each of lead and zinc the first year, 500 the second year, and 250 tons the third and last year. It would

contain proper safeguards against unwarranted windfall profits and was designed not to build up production that could not stand on its own feet in the future.

We believe the subsidy provisions in the bill before your committee to be too liberal. I leave to the Department of the Interior the assessment of the effect on the industry and the administrative difficulties. I understand, however, that such a subsidy could raise the production of lead and zinc by 40,000 tons or more for each metal. Such a volume would exert a downward pressure on prices, to the detriment of the unsubsidized sector of the industry. Such lower prices would cause concern to those friendly countries who depend on the U.S. market for a significant part of their sales of lead and zinc. Not only less developed countries such as Mexico and Peru depend on sales to the United States, but also Australia and Canada, which are important markets for American exports, need these earnings to help balance their accounts with us. Representatives of some of these countries have told us that the administration subsidy proposal would not injure them appreciably but that they were apprehensive of the proposal in S. 1747.

Tariff Provisions of S. 1747

Turning to the import tax provisions contained in title III of S. 1747, the Department of State earnestly hopes that they will not be approved. In the first place it would be inconsistent with the general policy of leaving adjustments in tariff rates to machinery set up in the Trade Agreements Act and other administrative arrangements and of not legislating directly on individual commodities. Such a change would discourage the countries with whom we must work to reduce barriers to our own trade.

When we imposed import quotas on lead and zinc concentrates and metal in 1958 under the escape-clause procedure of the Trade Agreements Act, the other countries who were members of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and who suffered injury to their trade were entitled to ask us for compensation. They did not do so because they understood our problem and because they believed that our action was temporary and would be removed when conditions warranted. If we proceed to legislate increases in import duties there will be no reason why they should not ask

² BULLETIN of Aug. 21, 1961, p. 340.

for compensation. We would be obliged to offer reductions in some other tariff rates or perhaps to see these other countries raise barriers against us.

The tariff provisions of S. 1747 aim at the establishment of a domestic price for each of lead and zinc metal at between 13½ cents and 14½ cents per pound. There is good evidence that this is neither necessary nor wise from the point of view of the industry. Both metals have lost heavily from the impact of substitutes in the past decade. This process will be encouraged by the maintenance of a high price. While present prices may well be too low for a long-term balance between supply and demand, it will only compound the difficulty to aim at a price that is too high. The Department of State does not know the price level that will prove to be economically sound for lead and zinc, but the Department of the Interior has pointed out that economic forces probably would not let the prices for these metals reach 14½ cents per pound more than temporarily. We believe that the targets are too high and that other means should be used to achieve more modest goals.

The decline in the domestic market for lead and zinc has been the basic problem for the domestic industry. The quotas have not maintained the domestic price at acceptable levels because of this falloff in domestic demand. But this has been due to domestic factors and not to an increase in cheaper imports, since the quotas have limited imports to 80 percent of the 1953-57 average. If lead and zinc had maintained their markets over the past 5 years against domestic substitute materials, their sales would have been about 10 percent, or about 100,000 tons, higher. Few people would deny that the industry would have been prosperous under those conditions.

Symbolic Character of Lead and Zinc

Lead and zinc have been given a symbolic character by other countries which raises intense emotional and political reactions even in countries that are not substantially affected economically. This is especially true in Latin America but is remarkably present in other areas of the world. There is little doubt that more restrictive action on trade in these metals by the United States would be interpreted as a retreat from international co-operation as a means of solving economic problems. Coming at a time when we need the coop-

eration of others in reducing barriers to our trade, this would establish an unfavorable atmosphere.

The Department of State has been using its best efforts internationally to improve the position of lead and zinc and thus benefit the industry in this country. Through the International Lead and Zinc Study Group³ we regularly examine both the short-term and long-term problems in this field. Several actions have been tried to overcome the weak market prices in these metals. Sales were voluntarily restricted by some countries. Others cut their production. The United States has contracted to take 100,000 tons of surplus lead off the market through barter for our agricultural surpluses from producers who undertook to reduce their output. None of these actions have had the full effect desired. In the main, lack of success has been due to failure of demand in the United States to return to what has been normal levels in the past. The Study Group will meet again this October in Geneva. The clear intention on the part of the United States to continue attacking the problem multilaterally instead of taking unilateral action will contribute greatly to our international position in these times.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

87th Congress, 1st Session

Disarmament Agency. Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on S. 2180, a bill to establish a U.S. Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security. August 14-16, 1961. 352 pp.

Analysis of the Khrushchev Speech of January 6, 1961. Hearing before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Testimony of Dr. Stefan T. Possony. June 16, 1961. S. Doc. 46. August 24, 1961. 100 pp.

Promotion of United States Exports. Hearing before Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Banking and Currency Committee on H.R. 8381, a bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, H.R. 7102 and H.R. 7103, bills to create an American Export Credits Guaranty Corporation, and H.R. 7266 and H.R. 8249, bills to encourage and promote the expansion through private enterprise of domestic exports in world markets. August 30, 1961. 156 pp.

Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. Report to accompany H.R. 8666. H. Rept. 1094. August 31, 1961. 42 pp.

Amendments to the Budget Involving an Increase in Appropriations for the Agency for International Development. Communication from the President. H. Doc. 230. September 1, 1961. 2 pp.

³ For background, see *ibid.*, May 9, 1960, p. 758.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Calendar of International Conferences and Meetings¹

Adjourned During September 1961

Conference on Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon Tests	Geneva	Oct. 31, 1958— Sept. 9, 1961
22d International Exhibition of Cinematographic Art	Venice	Aug. 20—Sept. 3
15th Annual Edinburgh Film Festival	Edinburgh	Aug. 20—Sept. 9
10th Pacific Science Congress	Honolulu	Aug. 21—Sept. 1
U.N. ECAFE Seminar on Planning and Administration of National Community Development Programs	Bangkok	Aug. 22—Sept. 16
South Pacific Commission: Women's Interests Training Seminar	Apia, Western Samoa	Aug. 24—Sept. 22
U.N. ECOSOC Committee of Experts on Transportation of Dangerous Goods	Geneva	Aug. 28—Sept. 1
GATT Working Party on the Review of Article XXXV	Geneva	Aug. 28—Sept. 6
U.N. Scientific Committee on Effects of Atomic Radiation: 10th Session	New York	Aug. 28—Sept. 15
International Conference on Currency Counterfeiting	Copenhagen	Aug. 29—Sept. 1
ICAO Diplomatic Conference on the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air Performed by a Person Other Than the Contracting Carrier	Guadalajara, Mexico	Aug. 29—Sept. 18
WHO Regional Committee for Western Pacific: 12th Session	Wellington	Aug. 31—Sept. 5
IA—ECOSOC First Inter-American Traffic Seminar	Washington	Sept. 4—8
U.N. ECAFE Asian Conference on Community Development	Bangkok	Sept. 4—8
U.N. ECE Working Party on Mechanization of Agriculture	Geneva	Sept. 4—8
International Criminal Police Organization: 30th General Assembly	Copenhagen	Sept. 4—9
Caribbean Commission: 31st Meeting	San Juan	Sept. 5 (1 day)
International Seed Testing Association: Executive Committee	Wageningen, Netherlands	Sept. 5—7
Caribbean Organization: 1st Meeting	San Juan	Sept. 6—15
ICEM Subcommittee on Budget and Finance: 4th Session	Washington	Sept. 6—15
ICEM Subcommittee on Budget and Finance: 1st Session of Working Party	Washington	Sept. 6—15
U.N. ECAFE Seminar on Industrial Statistics	Bangkok	Sept. 7—23
NATO Planning Board for European Inland Surface Transport	Paris	Sept. 8—9
GATT Working Party on the Budget	Geneva	Sept. 11—15
U.N. ECE Working Party on Transport of Perishable Foodstuffs	Geneva	Sept. 11—15
U.N. ECE Committee on Trade: 10th Session	Geneva	Sept. 11—18
Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses: 20th International Congress	Baltimore	Sept. 11—19
GATT Committee III on Expansion of International Trade	Geneva	Sept. 11—22
Washington Foreign Ministers Conference	Washington	Sept. 14—16
Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission: Special Meeting	Long Beach, Calif.	Sept. 14—16
50th Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union	Brussels	Sept. 14—22
UNESCO Executive Board Subcommittees	Paris	Sept. 14—22
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Monetary Fund, International Finance Corporation, International Development Association: Annual Meetings of Boards of Governors	Vienna	Sept. 18—22
ILO Tripartite Subcommittee of the Joint Maritime Commission on Seafarers' Welfare: 2d Session	Geneva	Sept. 18—23
U.N. ECAFE Symposium on Dams and Reservoirs	Tokyo	Sept. 18—23
NATO Civil Defense Committee	Paris	Sept. 19—20
FAO International Conference on Fish in Nutrition	Washington	Sept. 19—27
IAEA Board of Governors	Vienna	Sept. 22—25

¹ Prepared in the Office of International Conferences, Sept. 28, 1961. Following is a list of abbreviations: ECAFE, Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East; ECE, Economic Commission for Europe; ECOSOC, Economic and Social Council; FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization; GATT, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; IAEA, International Atomic Energy Agency; IA—ECOSOC, Inter-American Economic and Social Council; ICAO, International Civil Aviation Organization; ICEM, Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; ILO, International Labor Organization; NATO, North Atlantic Treaty Organization; U.N., United Nations; UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; WHO, World Health Organization; WMO, World Meteorological Organization.

Calendar of International Conferences and Meetings—Continued

Adjourned During September 1961—Continued

U.N. ECE Steel Committee: 26th Session	Geneva	Sept. 25-26
U.N. ECE Inland Transport Committee: Working Party on Road Traffic Accidents.	Geneva	Sept. 25-29
UNESCO Intergovernmental Copyright Committee: 6th Session	Madrid	Sept. 25-30
GATT Working Party on Swiss Accession	Geneva	Sept. 26-28
NATO Manpower Planning Committee	Paris	Sept. 27-28
U.N. ECE <i>Ad Hoc</i> Working Party on General Conditions of Sale for Steel Products and Iron, Chromium, and Manganese Ores.	Geneva	Sept. 27-28

In Session as of September 30, 1961

5th Round of GATT Tariff Negotiations	Geneva	Sept. 1, 1960-
International Conference for the Settlement of the Laotian Question.	Geneva	May 16-
U.N. Sugar Conference	Geneva	Sept. 12-
4th ICAO North Atlantic Regional Air Navigation Meeting	Paris	Sept. 14-
WMO Commission for Aerology: 3d Session	Rome	Sept. 18-
U.N. General Assembly: 16th Session	New York	Sept. 19-
ILO Joint Maritime Commission: 19th Session	Geneva	Sept. 25-
GATT Council of Representatives to the Contracting Parties	Geneva	Sept. 25-
IAEA General Conference: 5th Regular Session	Vienna	Sept. 26-
U.N. ECAFE Conference of Asian Economic Planners	New Delhi	Sept. 26-

U.S. Submits Proposal for General and Complete Disarmament to U.N.

U.N. doc. A/4891

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

SEPTEMBER 25, 1961

I have the honour to transmit the text of the proposal entitled "Declaration on Disarmament—The United States Programme for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World", to which reference was made by President Kennedy in his address to the General Assembly today.¹

I would be grateful if this letter with its enclosure were circulated as soon as possible to all Members of the United Nations for the information of the General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission.

ADLAI E. STEVENSON

TEXT OF PROPOSED DECLARATION

The following is submitted by the United States of America as a proposed Declaration on Disarmament for consideration by the General Assembly

¹ See p. 619. For text of a U.S.-U.S.S.R. report to the General Assembly, with a joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations and supplementary U.S. documents, see BULLETIN of Oct. 9, 1961, p. 589.

of the United Nations as a guide for the negotiation of a programme for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world.

DECLARATION ON DISARMAMENT: A PROGRAMME FOR GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD

The Nations of the world,

Conscious of the crisis in human history produced by the revolutionary development of modern weapons within a world divided by serious ideological differences;

Determined to save present and succeeding generations from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of the arms race and to create conditions in which all peoples can strive freely and peacefully to fulfil their basic aspirations;

Declare their goal to be: a free, secure, and peaceful world of independent States adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law; a world where adjustment to change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations; a world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control and where the resources of nations shall be devoted to man's material, cultural and spiritual advance;

Set forth as the objectives of a programme of

general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world:

(a) The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their re-establishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations Peace Force;

(b) The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations Peace Force and for maintaining internal order;

(c) The establishment and effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations to ensure compliance at all times with all disarmament obligations;

(d) The institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations;

Call on the negotiating States:

(a) To develop the outline programme set forth below into an agreed plan for general and complete disarmament and to continue their efforts without interruption until the whole programme has been achieved;

(b) To this end to seek to attain the widest possible area of agreement at the earliest possible date;

(c) Also to seek—without prejudice to progress on the disarmament programme—agreement on those immediate measures that would contribute to the common security of nations and that could facilitate and form a part of that programme;

Affirm that disarmament negotiations should be guided by the following principles:

(a) Disarmament shall take place as rapidly as possible until it is completed in stages containing balanced, phased and safeguarded measures, with each measure and stage to be carried out in an agreed period of time.

(b) Compliance with all disarmament obligations shall be effectively verified from their entry into force. Verification arrangements shall be instituted progressively and in such a manner as to verify not only that agreed limitations or reductions take place but also that retained armed

forces and armaments do not exceed agreed levels at any stage.

(c) Disarmament shall take place in a manner that will not affect adversely the security of any State, whether or not a party to an international agreement or treaty.

(d) As States relinquish their arms, the United Nations shall be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to assure international security and the peaceful settlement of differences as well as to facilitate the development of international co-operation in common tasks for the benefit of mankind.

(e) Transition from one stage of disarmament to the next shall take place as soon as all the measures in the preceding stage have been carried out and effective verification is continuing and as soon as the arrangements that have been agreed to be necessary for the next stage have been instituted.

Agree upon the following outline programme for achieving general and complete disarmament:

STAGE I

A. *To Establish an International Disarmament Organization:*

(a) An International Disarmament Organization (IDO) shall be established within the framework of the United Nations upon entry into force of the agreement. Its functions shall be expanded progressively as required for the effective verification of the disarmament programme.

(b) The IDO shall have: (1) a General Conference of all the parties; (2) a Commission consisting of representatives of all the major Powers as permanent members and certain other States on a rotating basis; and (3) an Administrator who will administer the Organization subject to the direction of the Commission and who will have the authority, staff, and finances adequate to assure effective impartial implementation of the functions of the Organization.

(c) The IDO shall: (1) ensure compliance with the obligations undertaken by verifying the execution of measures agreed upon; (2) assist the States in developing the details of agreed further verification and disarmament measures; (3) provide for the establishment of such bodies as may be necessary for working out the details of further measures provided for in the programme and for such other expert study groups as may be

required to give continuous study to the problems of disarmament; (4) receive reports on the progress of disarmament and verification arrangements and determine the transition from one stage to the next.

B. To Reduce Armed Forces and Armaments:

(a) Force levels shall be limited to 2.1 million each for the United States and USSR and to appropriate levels not exceeding 2.1 million each for all other militarily significant States. Reductions to the agreed levels will proceed by equitable, proportionate, and verified steps.

(b) Levels of armaments of prescribed types shall be reduced by equitable and balanced steps. The reductions shall be accomplished by transfers of armaments to depots supervised by the IDO. When, at specified periods during the Stage I reduction process, the States party to the agreement have agreed that the armaments and armed forces are at prescribed levels, the armaments in depots shall be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

(c) The production of agreed types of armaments shall be limited.

(d) A Chemical, Biological, Radiological (CBR) Experts Commission shall be established within the IDO for the purpose of examining and reporting on the feasibility and means for accomplishing the verifiable reduction and eventual elimination of CBR weapons stockpiles and the halting of their production.

C. To Contain and Reduce the Nuclear Threat:

(a) States that have not acceded to a treaty effectively prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons shall do so.

(b) The production of fissionable materials for use in weapons shall be stopped.

(c) Upon the cessation of production of fissionable materials for use in weapons, agreed initial quantities of fissionable materials from past production shall be transferred to non-weapons purposes.

(d) Any fissionable materials transferred between countries for peaceful uses of nuclear energy shall be subject to appropriate safeguards to be developed in agreement with the IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency].

(e) States owning nuclear weapons shall not relinquish control of such weapons to any nation not owning them and shall not transmit to any

such nation the information or material necessary for their manufacture. States not owning nuclear weapons shall not manufacture such weapons, attempt to obtain control of such weapons belonging to other States, or seek or receive information or materials necessary for their manufacture.

(f) A Nuclear Experts Commission consisting of representatives of the nuclear States shall be established within the IDO for the purpose of examining and reporting on the feasibility and means for accomplishing the verified reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles.

D. To Reduce Strategic Nuclear Weapons Delivery Vehicles:

(a) Strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles in specified categories and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be reduced to agreed levels by equitable and balanced steps. The reduction shall be accomplished in each step by transfers to depots supervised by the IDO of vehicles that are in excess of levels agreed upon for each step. At specified periods during the Stage I reduction process, the vehicles that have been placed under supervision of the IDO shall be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

(b) Production of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be discontinued or limited.

(c) Testing of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be limited or halted.

E. To Promote the Peaceful Use of Outer Space:

(a) The placing into orbit or stationing in outer space of weapons capable of producing mass destruction shall be prohibited.

(b) States shall give advance notification to participating States and to the IDO of launches of space vehicles and missiles, together with the track of the vehicle.

F. To Reduce the Risks of War by Accident, Miscalculation, and Surprise Attack:

(a) States shall give advance notification to the participating States and to the IDO of major military movements and manoeuvres, on a scale as

may be agreed, which might give rise to misinterpretation or cause alarm and induce counter-measures. The notification shall include the geographic areas to be used and the nature, scale and time span of the event.

(b) There shall be established observation posts at such locations as major ports, railway centres, motor highways, and air bases to report on concentrations and movements of military forces.

(c) There shall also be established such additional inspection arrangements to reduce the danger of surprise attack as may be agreed.

(d) An international commission shall be established immediately within the IDO to examine and make recommendations on the possibility of further measures to reduce the risks of nuclear war by accident, miscalculation, or failure of communication.

G. To Keep the Peace:

(a) States shall reaffirm their obligations under the United Nations Charter to refrain from the threat or use of any type of armed force—including nuclear, conventional, or CBR—contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter.

(b) States shall agree to refrain from indirect aggression and subversion against any country.

(c) States shall use all appropriate processes for the peaceful settlement of disputes and shall seek within the United Nations further arrangements for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and for the codification and progressive development of international law.

(d) States shall develop arrangements in Stage I for the establishment in Stage II of a United Nations peace force.

(e) A United Nations peace observation group shall be staffed with a standing cadre of observers who could be dispatched to investigate any situation which might constitute a threat to or breach of the peace.

STAGE II

A. International Disarmament Organization:

The powers and responsibilities of the IDO shall be progressively enlarged in order to give it the capabilities to verify the measures undertaken in Stage II.

B. To Further Reduce Armed Forces and Armaments:

(a) Levels of forces for the United States, USSR, and other militarily significant States shall be further reduced by substantial amounts to agreed levels in equitable and balanced steps.

(b) Levels of armaments of prescribed types shall be further reduced by equitable and balanced steps. The reduction shall be accomplished by transfers of armaments to depots supervised by the IDO. When, at specified periods during the Stage II reduction process, the parties have agreed that the armaments and armed forces are at prescribed levels, the armaments in depots shall be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

(c) There shall be further agreed restrictions on the production of armaments.

(d) Agreed military bases and facilities wherever they are located shall be dismantled or converted to peaceful uses.

(e) Depending upon the findings of the Experts Commission on CBR weapons, the production of CBR weapons shall be halted, existing stocks progressively reduced, and the resulting excess quantities destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

C. To Further Reduce the Nuclear Threat:

Stocks of nuclear weapons shall be progressively reduced to the minimum levels which can be agreed upon as a result of the findings of the Nuclear Experts Commission; the resulting excess of fissionable material shall be transferred to peaceful purposes.

D. To Further Reduce Strategic Nuclear Weapons Delivery Vehicles:

Further reductions in the stocks of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be carried out in accordance with the procedure outlined in Stage I.

E. To Keep the Peace:

During Stage II, States shall develop further the peace-keeping processes of the United Nations, to the end that the United Nations can effectively in Stage III deter or suppress any threat or use of force in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations:

(a) States shall agree upon strengthening the structure, authority, and operation of the United Nations so as to assure that the United Nations

will be able effectively to protect States against threats to or breaches of the peace.

(b) The United Nations peace force shall be established and progressively strengthened.

(c) States shall also agree upon further improvements and developments in rules of international conduct and in processes for peaceful settlement of disputes and differences.

STAGE III

By the time Stage II has been completed, the confidence produced through a verified disarmament programme, the acceptance of rules of peaceful international behaviour, and the development of strengthened international peace-keeping processes within the framework of the United Nations should have reached a point where the States of the world can move forward to Stage III. In Stage III, progressive controlled disarmament and continuously developing principles and procedures of international law would proceed to a point where no State would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened United Nations Peace Force and all international disputes would be settled according to the agreed principles of international conduct.

The progressive steps to be taken during the final phase of the disarmament programme would be directed toward the attainment of a world in which:

(a) States would retain only those forces, non-nuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a United Nations Peace Force.

(b) The United Nations Peace Force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.

(c) The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the United Nations Peace Force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes.

(d) The peace-keeping capabilities of the United Nations would be sufficiently strong and the obligations of all States under such arrangements sufficiently far-reaching as to assure peace and the just settlement of differences in a disarmed world.

Security Council Debates Admission of New Members to U.N.

Following are two statements made on September 26 in the Security Council by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative, on the applications for U.N. membership of Mauritania, Outer Mongolia, and Sierra Leone.

MAURITANIA AND OUTER MONGOLIA

U.S./U.N. press release 3779

Let me first say that we are very happy to know that the Foreign Minister of Sierra Leone, Dr. Karefa Smart, is here in the Council chamber this morning. And I would also like to express my pleasure that the Soviet Union has agreed to the prior consideration of the application for membership of Sierra Leone.

As to the order of our voting this morning, we would suggest that the Ceylonese motion on the application of Sierra Leone be considered first and then proceed to a vote on the Soviet motion.

As to the latter we are obliged to oppose the motion to take up Outer Mongolia before Mauritania, which is the effect of the Soviet proposal, as I understand it. Last fall the Republic of Mauritania was considered by the Security Council for membership in the United Nations, just as other new African states had been considered and promptly approved. But after the Security Council met last year, I remind you, the Soviet Union injected the question of Outer Mongolia into the discussion in an effort to create a so-called "package deal" and to justify thereby its decision to veto the application of Mauritania.¹ In short the application of Outer Mongolia was not even raised until after the Council had been, in fact, convened to consider Mauritania.

The present proposal to give priority to Outer Mongolia over Mauritania is another attempt to justify this opposition.

I do not think there is anyone here who can deny that Mauritania less than a year ago was unfairly and unjustly barred from membership for reasons that have nothing to do with Mauritania or with Africa. Mauritania, regrettably, is in

¹ BULLETIN of Dec. 26, 1960, p. 976.

volved in an African controversy. We must face that fact with understanding. But to complicate it by artificially injecting disputes and disagreements entirely of a different nature and order of magnitude seems to us both unfair and unjust.

There is, I believe, a widespread and sincere desire among the great majority of countries in the United Nations to see Mauritania admitted to membership promptly. And we can see no justification for asking that the order of the agenda be revised in order to give Outer Mongolia a priority and thereby perhaps perpetuate the injustice to Mauritania. We hope that the Council will therefore reject the Soviet motion when we reach it in the course of the discussion this morning.²

SIERRA LEONE

U.S./U.N. press release 3781

The United States welcomes the application of Sierra Leone for membership in the United Nations. Sierra Leone has had a long and distinguished history filled with episodes of valor and of hardship. The purpose of its establishment, as we well know in this country, in 1787 was to assist in the abolition of slavery. For many years it was to Sierra Leone that captured slave ships were brought for trial and disposition. The part it played in the elimination of that abominable traffic was a very significant and vital one.

Over the years Sierra Leone progressed steadily toward independence. In 1863 it received separate executive and legislative councils. By 1925 it had a constitution which provided for election of African legislative councilors. By 1948 the number of elected members of the legislative council was made greater than the number of appointed members.

Meanwhile economic development was steadily pursued. The construction of a railroad from Freetown to the interior between 1896 and 1908 made it possible to develop an export trade. With the discovery of valuable iron ore and diamond deposits in the 1930's, the colony increased in economic importance.

On April 27, 1961, the green, white, and blue flag of independent Sierra Leone flew for the first

²The Soviet motion to consider the application of Outer Mongolia before that of Mauritania was rejected.

time at a moving ceremony which the United States was honored to attend. On that occasion the President of our country sent the good wishes of the people of the United States to the people of Sierra Leone, whom he described as "a people who cherish individual liberty and independence, and who have made great sacrifices so that these vital principles might endure."³

Mr. President, the Security Council again has the happy task of voting on the admission of a new African state for membership. There have been many in recent months and years, but the experience never fails to be moving or the occasion heartening. The United States welcomes the application of Sierra Leone to membership in the United Nations, as I have said. We voted with pleasure for the resolution sponsored by Ceylon and the United Kingdom and Liberia and we look forward with equal pleasure to working with the representatives of Sierra Leone during the coming months and years.⁴

U.S. Welcomes Inception of OECD

Following is the text of a message from Secretary Rusk to Thorkil Kristensen, Secretary General of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, on the occasion of the entry into force on September 30 of the convention establishing the OECD.¹

Press release 675 dated September 29

SEPTEMBER 29, 1961

DEAR MR. SECRETARY GENERAL: The Government of the United States is gratified by the entry into force of the Convention establishing the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. This historic event represents the beginning of a new era in the long and intimate relationship between Europe and North America.

The task of postwar reconstruction is behind

¹BULLETIN of May 15, 1961, p. 733.

²The Council on Sept. 26 recommended without opposition that Sierra Leone be admitted to membership in the United Nations. On Sept. 27 the General Assembly admitted Sierra Leone by acclamation.

³For text of convention, see BULLETIN of Jan. 2, 1961, p. 11.

us. We have not only recovered from the ravages of World War II, but most of us have achieved new levels of prosperity and social well-being. This economic and social growth is all the more remarkable when we remember that many nations of the Atlantic Community have been compelled to devote substantial energies and resources to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The tasks that lie ahead are no less challenging. We must intensify cooperative activities designed to sustain and accelerate the economic growth of every member of the Atlantic Community. We must work together to encourage worldwide patterns of trade and investment that will not only be beneficial to our own peoples, but that will also meet the diverse needs of free peoples on every continent. Finally, we must cooperate to utilize more effectively our growing economic resources to promote economic, social and technical development in the less advanced regions of the world.

The United States Government is confident that the new instrumentalities of the OECD can greatly assist the performance of these tasks and can thereby bring the Atlantic partnership to a higher plateau of unity and vitality. The ultimate success of the OECD—its capacity to serve the far-reaching purposes for which it has been created—depends upon the full cooperation of every member. I want to assure you of the whole-hearted support of the Government of the United States.

DEAN RUSK

U.S. Representatives Named to IAEA General Conference

The Senate on September 14 confirmed Glenn T. Seaborg to be the representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The following-named persons were confirmed on the same date to be alternate representatives: Henry DeWolf Smyth, William I. Cargo, John S. Graham, and Leland J. Haworth.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Caribbean Commission

Agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Commission. Signed at Washington October 30, 1946. Entered into force for the United States August 6, 1948. TIAS 1799.

Terminated: September 15, 1961 (replaced by the agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Organization, signed at Washington June 21, 1960).

Finance

Articles of agreement of the International Development Association. Done at Washington January 28, 1960. Entered into force September 24, 1960. TIAS 4607. *Signatures and acceptances:* Panama, September 1, 1961; Peru, August 30, 1961.

Postal Services

Universal postal convention with final protocol, annex, regulations of execution, and provisions regarding airmail with final protocol. Done at Ottawa October 3, 1957. Entered into force April 1, 1959. TIAS 4202. *Adherence deposited:* Central African Republic, June 28, 1961.

Publications

Agreement relating to the repression of the circulation of obscene publications, as amended by the protocol of May 4, 1949 (TIAS 2164). Signed at Paris May 4, 1910. Entered into force September 15, 1911. 37 Stat. 1511.

Assumed applicable obligations and responsibilities of the United Kingdom: Nigeria, June 26, 1961.

Convention concerning the international exchange of publications. Adopted at Paris December 3, 1958.¹

Acceptance deposited: Italy, August 2, 1961.

Convention concerning the exchange of official publications and government documents between states. Adopted at Paris December 3, 1958. Entered into force May 30, 1961.²

Ratification deposited: Ecuador, February 8, 1961.

Acceptances deposited: Italy, August 2, 1961; United Kingdom, June 1, 1961.

Extension to: Antigua, Bahamas, Bailiwick of Guernsey, Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, British Virgin Islands, Dominica, Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, Grenada, Isle of Man, Jamaica, Jersey, Malta, Montserrat, Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, State of Singapore, Trinidad and Tobago, June 1, 1961.

¹ Not in force.

² Not in force for the United States.

Telecommunications

International telecommunication convention with six annexes. Done at Geneva December 21, 1959. Entered into force January 1, 1961.³

Ratification advised by the Senate (with declarations): September 25, 1961.

Accession deposited: Togo, September 14, 1961.

Radio regulations, with appendixes, annexed to the international telecommunication convention, 1959, and additional protocol. Done at Geneva December 21, 1959. Entered into force May 1, 1961.³

Ratification advised by the Senate: September 25, 1961.

Trade and Commerce

Acknowledged applicable rights and obligations of the United Kingdom: Sierra Leone, August 22, 1961, with respect to the following:

Protocol amending part I and articles XXIX and XXX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva March 10, 1955.¹

Protocol of organizational amendments to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva March 10, 1955.¹

Agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation. Done at Geneva March 10, 1955.¹

Fifth protocol of rectifications and modifications to texts of the schedules to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva December 3, 1955.¹

Sixth protocol of rectifications and modifications to texts of the schedules to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva April 11, 1957.¹

Seventh protocol of rectifications and modifications to texts of the schedules to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva November 30, 1957.¹

Protocol relating to negotiations for establishment of new schedule III—Brazil—to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva December 31, 1958.¹

Eighth protocol of rectifications and modifications to texts of the schedules to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva February 18, 1959.¹

Procès-verbal containing schedules to be annexed to protocol relating to negotiations for establishment of new schedule III—Brazil—to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (Brazil and United Kingdom). Done at Geneva May 13, 1959.¹

Ninth protocol of rectifications and modifications to texts of the schedules to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Done at Geneva August 17, 1959.¹

Wheat

International wheat agreement, 1959, with annex. Opened for signature at Washington April 6 through 24, 1959. Entered into force July 16, 1959, for part I and parts III to VIII, and August 1, 1959, for part II. TIAS 4302.

Application to: Land Berlin, September 1, 1961.

BILATERAL

Ceylon

Agreement relating to the settlement of matters in connection with a purchase authorization under the surplus agricultural commodities agreement of March 13, 1959.

³ Includes all territories of the United States.

as amended (TIAS 4211 and 4242). Effect by exchange of notes at Washington December 1 and 8, 1959. Entered into force December 8, 1959.

Indonesia

Agreement amending the agricultural commodities agreement of November 5, 1960, as amended (TIAS 4616 and 4709). Effect by exchange of notes at Djakarta September 8, 1961. Entered into force September 8, 1961.

United Kingdom

Agreement relating to the reopening of the weather station on Betio Island. Effect by exchange of notes at Washington September 26, 1961. Entered into force September 26, 1961.

Uruguay

Agreement relating to radio communications between radio amateurs on behalf of third parties. Effect by exchange of notes at Montevideo September 12, 1961. Enters into force on the date of notification that parliamentary approval has been obtained by Uruguay.

Agreement amending the agreement of December 1, 1950 (TIAS 4375), supplementing the agricultural commodities agreement of February 20, 1959, as supplemented (TIAS 4179, 4238, 4356, 4406, and 4641). Effect by exchange of notes at Montevideo September 18, 1961. Entered into force September 18, 1961.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Confirmations

The Senate on September 21 confirmed the nomination of Charles W. Cole to be Ambassador to Chile. (For biographic details, see Department of State press release 669 dated September 28.)

The Senate on September 23 confirmed Fowler Hamilton to be Administrator of the Agency for International Development. (For biographic details, see White House press release dated September 20.)

Designations

Philip H. Burris as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Plans and Guidance, Bureau of Public Affairs, effective September 1.

Appointments

John M. Patterson as Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, effective August 28.

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

The Newly Independent Nations—

Dahomey. Pub. 7158. African Series 13. 12 pp. 15¢.
Ivory Coast. Pub. 7153. African Series 12. 7 pp. 10¢.
Niger. Pub. 7159. African Series 14. 11 pp. 15¢.

Leaflets, in a series of fact sheets, designed to give readers a few highlights on the peoples and lands of the newly independent nations.

Foreign Consular Offices in the United States. Pub. 7177. Department and Foreign Service Series 100. 55 pp. 20¢.

A complete and official listing of the foreign consular offices in the United States, with their jurisdictions and recognized personnel, compiled with the full cooperation of the foreign missions in Washington.

How Foreign Policy is Made. Pub. 7179. General Foreign Policy Series 104. 19 pp. 25¢.

This pamphlet describes the role of the President, the Congress, and the people in the formulation of American foreign policy.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Pub. 7182. Commercial Policy Series 178. 74 pp. 25¢.

A reproduction of the General Agreement as amended by various protocols, including those parts of the Protocol Amending the Preamble and Parts II and III and the Procès-Verbal of Rectification concerning that Protocol which became effective for two-thirds of the contracting parties, including the United States, on Oct. 7, 1957, and Feb. 15, 1961 (Article XIV).

Fact Sheet—Mutual Security in Action—Jordan. Pub. 7184. Near and Middle Eastern Series 61. 9 pp. 10¢.

Some basic facts about Jordan and principal areas of U.S. assistance which help to maintain its stability are outlined in this fact sheet.

A Basic Bibliography, Disarmament, Arms Control and National Security. Pub. 7193. Disarmament Series 1. 29 pp. Limited distribution.

A brief annotated list of books, pamphlets, and articles on disarmament, arms control, and related topics prepared as a preliminary introductory guide to the increasing volume of scholarly and popular writing in this field.

U.S. Balance of Payments, Questions and Answers. Pub. 7194. General and Foreign Policy Series 166. 16 pp. 15¢.

A pamphlet explaining the meaning of U.S. "balance of payments" and of the measures proposed to eliminate the remaining "basic" deficit.

Aid in Action—How U.S. Aid Lends a Hand Around the World. Pub. 7221. General Foreign Policy Series 172. 63 pp. 25¢.

This booklet cites many examples of the remarkable successes of the foreign aid program, achieved through U.S. technical and financial assistance over the past decade to the underdeveloped countries of the world.

Toward A National Effort in International Educational and Cultural Affairs. Pub. 7238. International Information and Cultural Series 78. 82 pp. 35¢.

Report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange in the area of international and cultural affairs prepared by Walter H. C. Laves, chairman, Department of Government, Indiana University.

Foreign Aid—Facts and Fallacies. Pub. 7239. General Foreign Policy Series 176. 52 pp. Limited distribution.

This pamphlet presents the facts about some of the major criticisms of the foreign aid program and includes a supplement which outlines some of the benefits the United States derives from the program.

Educational and Cultural Exchange Opportunities (Revised). Pub. 7201. International Information and Cultural Series 77. 27 pp. 15¢.

A pamphlet which sets forth the scope of the international educational and cultural program administered by the Department of State.

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: September 25—October 1

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C. Releases appearing in this issue of the BULLETIN which were issued prior to September 25 are Nos. 639, 641, and 641A of September 18, 648 of September 20, and 650 of September 21.

No.	Date	Subject
*660	9/25	U.S. participation in international conferences.
661	9/25	Rusk: "Continental Classroom."
†662	9/25	Sanjuan: public accommodations for diplomats.
663	9/26	Note to U.S.S.R. on landing of West German aircraft at Berlin.
*664	9/25	Bowles: death of Sumner Welles.
*665	9/26	MacPhail designated USOM director, Libya (biographic details).
666	9/26	Williams plans trips to Africa (rewrite).
*667	9/27	Morris sworn in as ICA representative, Venezuela (biographic details).
*668	9/27	Moline sworn in as USOM director, United Arab Republic (biographic details).
*669	9/28	Cole sworn in as ambassador to Chile (biographic details).
*670	9/28	Cultural exchange (Sudan).
*671	9/29	Program for visit of President of Sudan.
*672	9/29	Rowan: NYU panel discussion on Government press relations.
674	9/29	CENTO telecommunications project.
675	9/29	Rusk: entry into force of OECD.
†676	9/30	Louchheim: D.C. Federation of BPW Clubs.
*677	9/30	Program for visit of President of Finland.

*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

Africa
 Assistant Secretary Williams Plans Two More Trips to Africa
 Southern Africa in Transition (Williams)

American Principles. The Obligation To Understand the American System of Government (Rusk)

Angola. Southern Africa in Transition (Williams).

Atomic Energy
 U.S. Makes Additional Quantities of Uranium 235 Available (Kennedy, Seaborg)
 U.S. Representatives Named to IAEA General Conference

Chile. Cole confirmed as Ambassador

Congress, The
 Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy
 Department Opposes Tariff on Lead and Zinc (Martin)
 President Signs Bill Creating U.S. Disarmament Agency (Kennedy)

Department and Foreign Service
 Appointments (Patterson)
 Confirmations (Cole, Hamilton)
 Designations (Burris)

Disarmament
 "Let Us Call a Truce to Terror" (Kennedy)
 President Signs Bill Creating U.S. Disarmament Agency (Kennedy)
 U.S. Submits Proposal for General and Complete Disarmament to U.N. (Stevenson, text of proposed declaration)

Economic Affairs
 CENTO Telecommunications Project Contract Signed
 Department Opposes Tariff on Lead and Zinc (Martin)
 Import Restrictions on Tung Oil and Tung Nuts To Be Studied (Kennedy)
 U.S. Welcomes Inception of OECD (Rusk)

Germany
 "Let Us Call a Truce to Terror" (Kennedy)
 U.S. Replies to Soviet Complaint on Flight of West German Planes (texts of U.S. and Soviet notes)

International Organizations and Conferences
 Calendar of International Conferences and Meetings
 CENTO Telecommunications Project Contract Signed
 U.S. Representatives Named to IAEA General Conference
 U.S. Welcomes Inception of OECD (Rusk)

Iran. CENTO Telecommunications Project Contract Signed

Japan. A Pacific Partnership (McConaughy)

Laos. Ambassador Harriman Visits Southeast Asia (Harriman)

Mauritania. Security Council Debates Admission of New Members to U.N. (Stevenson)	654
Mutual Security	
CENTO Telecommunications Project Contract Signed	642
Hamilton confirmed as Administrator of Agency for International Development	657
Non-Self-Governing Territories. Southern Africa in Transition (Williams)	638
Outer Mongolia. Security Council Debates Admission of New Members to U.N. (Stevenson)	654
Pakistan. CENTO Telecommunications Project Contract Signed	642
Portugal. Southern Africa in Transition (Williams)	638
Presidential Documents	
Import Restrictions on Tung Oil and Tung Nuts To Be Studied	645
"Let Us Call a Truce to Terror"	619
President Signs Bill Creating U.S. Disarmament Agency	646
U.S. Makes Additional Quantities of Uranium 235 Available	643
Public Affairs. The Obligation To Understand the American System of Government (Rusk)	630
Publications. Recent Releases	658
Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Federation of. Southern Africa in Transition (Williams)	638
Sierra Leone. Security Council Debates Admission of New Members to U.N. (Stevenson)	654
Treaty Information. Current Actions	656
Turkey. CENTO Telecommunications Project Contract Signed	642
U.S.S.R. U.S. Replies to Soviet Complaint on Flight of West German Planes (texts of U.S. and Soviet notes)	632
United Nations	
Four Central Threads of U.S. Foreign Policy (Rusk)	625
"Let Us Call a Truce to Terror" (Kennedy)	619
Security Council Debates Admission of New Members to U.N. (Stevenson)	654
U.S. Submits Proposal for General and Complete Disarmament to U.N. (Stevenson, text of proposed declaration)	650
Name Index	
Burris, Philip H	657
Cole, Charles W	657
Hamilton, Fowler	657
Harriman, W. Averell	643
Kennedy, President	619, 643, 645, 646
Martin, Edwin M	646
McConaughy, Walter P	634
Patterson, John M	657
Rusk, Secretary	625, 630, 655
Seaborg, Glenn T	644
Stevenson, Adlai E	650, 654
Williams, G. Mennen	638, 642

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INC
EDITORIAL DEPT
313 N FIRST ST
ANN ARBOR, MICH
DSB-DEC



the
Department
of
State

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

UNITED NATIONS: GUARDIAN OF PEACE

This 45-page booklet, with photographs, contains excerpts from statements, addresses, and remarks made by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations. Among the topics covered are the United States and the United Nations, opportunities of U.N. membership, the role of the U.N. in African development, the U.N. operations in the Congo, and progress toward a world society under law.

Publication 7225

25 cents

FREEDOM FROM WAR

The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World

President Kennedy, in his address before the Sixteenth General Assembly of the United Nations, September 25, 1961, presented the U.S. new program for general and complete disarmament.

A summary of the principal provisions and the full text of the program are contained in this 19-page pamphlet.

Publication 7277

15 cents

CHILE

Rebuilding for a Better Future

Immediately following the disastrous Chilean earthquake of May 1960, the United States under the Mutual Security Program mounted one of the largest emergency relief operations ever undertaken in peacetime.

This 28-page illustrated background includes details of the U.S. aid to Chile, information on the country's history, economy, political development, and other aspects of Chilean life, as well as a brief résumé of official U.S.-Chilean relations.

Publication 7228

25 cents

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$.....
(cash, check, or money
order payable to
Supt. of Docs.)

Please send me copies of:

FREEDOM FROM WAR
 UNITED NATIONS: GUARDIAN OF PEACE
 CHILE

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

